DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 899	IR 007 168
TITLE	School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials: Title II, ESEA. Annual Report, 1971.
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	100p.; Some tables are minimally legible due to small print size; Appendix removed; For related documents, see IR 007 166-IR 007 171, 180-183 and ED 086 215
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Needs; *Educational Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Expenditures; *Federal Programs; *Instructional Materials; *Library Materials; Manpower Needs; Program Administration; Program Development; Program Evaluation; School Libraries; Tables (Data); Textbooks
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title II; Right To Read

ABSTRACT

Based on the financial and narrative reports submitted by the States and other areas to the U.S. Office of Education, this annual report describes the operation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title II Program (ESEA Title II) in FY 1971 in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and areas under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The financial reports show expenditures for state administrative functions and local education agency expenditures for the acquisition of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials; these figures reflect for the first time the effects of the provision enabling the carry-over of funds into a succeeding fiscal year. The narrative reports describe management practices in the administration of the program, developments and accomplishments of the program in support of curriculum and instruction, including contributions to The Right To Read Program and services to private school children and teachers, and critical needs still existing. Six tables provide supportive statistics. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169899

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES, TEXTBOOKS, AND OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act
As Amended, Annual Report
Fiscal Year 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Caspar W. Weinberger, Secretary
Virginia Y. Trotter, Assistant Secretary for Education

Office of Education
T. H. Bell, Commissioner

IR007168

CONTENTS

		Page
1.	Introduction	1
2.	State Management of the Program	2
3.	Program Development	18
4.	Contributions to The Right To Read Program	43
5.	Services to Private School Children and Teachers	54
6.	Evaluation and Dissemination	57
7.	Needs	82

TABLES

1.	Funds available and funds expended for acquisition and State administration, percent of total expenditures for administration, percent of allotment expended, and funds carried over under ESEA title II: Fiscal year 1971	10
2.	Cost of State administration under ESEA title II, by object of expenditures: Fiscal year 1971	11
3.	Number of State department of education personnel assigned to ESEA title II programs: Fiscal year 1971	13
4.	Cost of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials acquired for loan to children and teachers; costs of ordering, cataloging, processing, and delivering materials; and percent of total acquisitions expended in each category under ESEA title II: Fiscal year 1971	14
5.	Cost of library books, periodicals, other printed materials, and audiovisual materials loaned to children and teachers as school library resources under ESEA title II, and percent of total for each type of material: Fiscal year 1971	16

Page

6. Cost of trade books, periodicals, other printed materials, and audiovisual materials loaned to children and teachers as other instructional materials under ESEA title II, and percent of total for each type of material: Fiscal year 1971 17

Appendix

ESEA title II Financial and Narrative Report Forms, Fiscal year 1971 97

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the sixth annual report on title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is a program providing direct Federal assistance for the acquisition of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools. The report compiles and analyzes information concerning the operation of the program in fiscal year 1971 in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior. The financial and narrative reports submitted by the States and other areas to the U.S. Office of Education at the close of fiscal year 1971 are the sources on which the report is based. The financial reports show expenditures for State administrative functions and for local education agency expenditures for the acquisition of the various categories of materials, and reflect for the first time the effect of the provision enabling the carry over of funds into a succeeding fiscal year. The narrative reports describe the management practices in the administration of the program, the developments and accomplishments of the program in its efforts to support curriculum and instruction, and the critical needs still existing.

In the U.S. Office of Education, title II was administered during fiscal year 1971 in the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education. For program administration, States and other participating agencies were divided into five regions of the United States, as follows:

Northeast	Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont.
Southeast	Alabama, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands.
Upper Midwest	Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin.
Mid-Continent	Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Louisiana, Montana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah, Wyoming.
Western	Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, American Samoa, Guam, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The examples from States cited to illustrate the various topics covered by the report are arranged in order by the geographic regions -- Northeast, Southeast, Upper Midwest, Mid-Continent, Western.

The authorizations and appropriations of the program up to and including fiscal year 1971 are as follows:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$100,000,000	$100,000,000
1967	125,000,000	102,000,000
1968	150,000,000	99,234,000
1969	162,500,000	50,000,000
1970	200,000,000	42,500,000
1971	200,000,000	80,000,000

In order to comply with the requirements of the amendment (P.L. 91-230) of April 30, 1970, which necessitated policy changes in the administration of the State plan/State grant programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the U.S. Office of Education developed a new State plan format to be followed by the States which would reduce State plan requirements to a minimum. It consisted primarily of a set of assurances setting forth the major provisions of the Title along with the attendant requirements brought about by the new legislation such as the consideration of the Governor. The new abbreviated State plan format became effective during fiscal year 1971; it was mandatory that every State be operating under it by July 1, 1971. In detailed discussions of these changes with State program coordinators during a series of regional conferences, it was recommended that the description of program and operational procedures, which would serve as a supplement to the State plan, be developed by State education agencies according to their own specific needs and goals through a management by objectives approach.

These changes, which eliminate the annual submittal of a program of projected activities, are spelled out in the revised Regulations, Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended. Title 45, Chapter 1, Part 117, reprinted from Federal Register, June 10, 1971.

2. STATE MANAGEMENT OF THE PROGRAM

Inclusion of ESEA Title II in Comprehensive Planning

Fiscal 1971 reports from the States showed the increased involvement of the title II staff in the systematic planning of comprehensive State agency programs, including the development of goals, objectives, evaluation strategies, and techniques for disseminating information for the title II--media segment of the educational structure. The establishment of planning and evaluation units through funds provided under Section 402 of the General Education Provisions Act was mentioned by several States as a source of assistance in planning. The planning process has included such steps as needs assessment, writing of goals and objectives, and the design of procedures to insure the most rapid attainment of the goals and objectives.

A number of States -- Delaware, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Vermont -- reported that title II staff were active in the development of department goals and objectives. In New Hampshire, the title II coordinator serves as a member of the Commissioner's cabinet which in 1971 developed objectives for each major division of the department. The Vermont Design for Education, a position paper and planning document developed by the State Department of Education, has been a real motivational force for the title II program in the State. Three States -- Delaware, Maine, and Massachusetts -- participated in management reviews of Federal programs in fiscal year 1971. The reviews analyzed the administration of Federal programs from the standpoint of seven management functions: planning, evaluation, project administration, dissemination, management information systems, personnel management, and financial management. Title II staff participated fully in these reviews and reported that they derived particular help in planning, evaluation, project administration, and dissemination.

With one exception, all State education agencies of the Southeast have established planning and evaluation units in the Department. Alabama, the District of Columbia, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virgin Islands, Virginia, and West Virginia include title II as a part of the total education program for the State. In Alabama, consideration is being given to the incorporation of forms used by ESEA title II with forms used by other offices to avoid duplication; consultants from the Division of Instruction were asked to assist the title II project staff in meeting the objectives of the program. In the District of Columbia, the dissemination brochure for ESEA title II was prepared with the help of the dissemination staff of the Department of Federal programs. In Maryland, as a result of establishment of objectives by each division of the State Department of Education, the ESEA title II program was geared to support identified priority programs. In Puerto Rico, the comprehensive plan for the Department of Education included a complete revision of the curriculum covering all subject areas; a synthesis comprising the general objectives content and teaching materials was published, together with the library resources needed to cope with this revision. Title II funds will help to meet this demand. In South Carolina, all federally funded programs were brought in line with the State's 5-year plan through the assignment of objectives to each of the various programs. In West Virginia, each local education agency was expected to use ESEA title II funds to support and strengthen segments of the State Comprehensive Education Program.

In the Upper Midwest, consideration given to the title II program in State education agency planning ranged from a great deal to very little. The Nebraska ESEA title II personnel were involved in the formulation of basic and related goals and objectives for education in the State. Wisconsin appointed a Federal program coordinator to coordinate Federal program objectives with those of the State Education Agency and to conduct workshops on management by objectives for all professional personnel. South Dakota's planning for decentralization leaned heavily on the ESEA title II program for support for demonstration and resource libraries in each of the three regional educational service centers. The newly established Division of Program Planning and Evaluation in the North Dakota education agency included title II in its planning for a three-phase study of the reading problems of the schoolage population. The Missouri State Department of Education established a Planning and Evaluation section which included the title II staff in a department-wide approach to planning and evaluation. Missouri completed a self-study of its management operations in ESEA title II. The Indiana title II planning was integrated into the overall State education planning. It dovetailed with the Department of Education's emphasis on special education and reading, the Research Department's focus on the utilization of computer-assisted data, the Division of Instruction's efforts to provide materials for supplementing State Department of Education programs at building and center levels, and the efforts of all divisions to provide materials and media for the professional library.

During fiscal year 1971, the Arizona Department of Education established a Division of Planning and Evaluation, the objectives of which include assessment of needs, development and use of learner-oriented objectives, and evaluation of the results of the Statewide third-grade reading test. Products of this work will be used in Federal project development and review. State education agency planning in Hawaii placed emphasis on various curriculum areas, such as: 1) a revision of the social studies curriculum to include current problems (ecology, human relations, economics, consumer education, and urban planning) in the secondary program, 2) an enriched, individualized, nongraded approach to the English-Language Arts program at all grade levels, and 3) an interdisciplinary approach to some subjects and/or units of study. Emphasis was placed also on special education and on increased opportunities for students confined to institutions. ESEA title II coordinated efforts to support and enrich these State plans by supplying materials to supplement the basic programs.

The Nevada State Department of Education has implemented a program of management by objectives. Specific activities of each consultant have been described in terms of process objectives, which include time factors, specific activities, and tangible outcomes. The process objectives relating directly to the ESEA title II program contain provisions for a monitoring as well as a dissemination schedule. The monitoring schedule has been correlated with schedules for other ESEA programs.

During the year, the entire staff of the Curriculum and Instruction Division of the Washington State education agency participated in the reorganization of the Division to implement a management by objectives system. More effective utilization of the total staff is one of the primary goals.

Relative Need Changes

The title II Regulations require that the criteria used to establish the relative need of children and teachers for materials that may be acquired under the program must be evaluated from time to time and adjusted to changing needs. A number of States reported that it was not necessary to change the relative need formula in fiscal year 1971; however, several States made adjustments in relative need criteria and formulas in order to assure the distribution of instructional materials to children and teachers with the greatest need. New Jersey, for example, changed the formula to provide additional materials for children and teachers in urban schools.

In Pennsylvania, the relative need criteria and formula were evaluated. The results indicated that no need to change currently existed; any priorities that the schools or subject area specialists wished to emphasize could be handled with the present formula. An amendment to the State Plan, however, provided funds for the purchase of materials for the examination centers maintained by the Department. The areas of early childhood, reading, drug education, and ecology were emphasized in the selection of these new materials. The Rhode Island relative need criteria and formula, formerly almost entirely directed to elementary schools, directed funds to secondary schools also in 1971. In addition, the State Plan was revised to fund special projects establishing model media centers to demonstrate the effectiveness of media on academic achievement in specific fields. New Hampshire made a modest change in the formula for allocating title II funds, reducing the economic factor from 50 percent to 45 percent. The amount reserved for granting special project funds was increased from 10 percent to 15 percent to develop elementary school libraries and fund projects related to the "Right-To-Read" program.

Georgia amended its relative need formula to include special demonstration projects for the first time. Virginia amended its distribution formula to allow funding of special curriculum projects.

9

Puerto Rico continued to reduce the percentage allowed for purchase of textbooks in order to adjust to new curriculum needs and priorities. The West Virginia relative need formula was amended to assure that funds are more equitably distributed by the local education agency. Under the new plan each local agency will have its own relative need index. Alabama, Maryland, and South Carolina retained their formulas but mandated that requests for materials be related to established State priorities.

Relative need formulas for the Upper Midwest States, except Wisconsin, remained unchanged. The reluctance to change the formula was due in part to changes in Chief State School Officers in five States, and to the nearly normal allotment which would allow the most needy school districts (according to present formula) to receive more assistance for one more year. Advisory councils in Iowa and Ohio have advised the State staff to present alternative formulas for the next year. The Wisconsin formula reflects what the local school district can actually afford and what is actually expended for materials. Information supplied on the school library/media inventory report was also a factor. In determining relative need for "Right to Read" special project grants, reading scores and needs of various cultural groups were considered.

In Arkansas, the revised relative need formula for the distribution of funds provides for new programs based on the offering of new courses of study or new methodology requiring special school library resources for implementation. Idaho reports no change in the relative need criteria and formula, per se. The only change was to use the increase in appropriation for special-purpose grants to support the Right to Read effort. The projects which were submitted ranged from those to be implemented in one classroom to library projects serving an entire student body. The quality of the projects was excellent, and the selection committee had a very difficult task in determining which ones to recommend for funding from the very limited funds available. The request for funds under this program exceeded the total Idaho allocation by $22,384.03. The same was true in New Mexico, where a larger percentage of the acquisition funds was directed to special projects and highest priority given to Right to Read and bilingual projects.

In Texas the relative need formula was adjusted to provide for: (1) an amount not to exceed 5 percent of the funds to be reserved for the 20 Regional Education Service Centers for the purpose of providing library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials selected to meet priority needs of pupils and teachers in the State; (2) an amount of not less than 25 percent and not more than 30 percent based on the ESEA title I student allocation.

Alaska's new relative need formula for the ESEA title II program sets aside funds for projects which establish outstanding school media centers, emphasize new and different practices and techniques for utilizing media to enhance learning, or focus on carefully identified, critical educational needs. Highest priority is assigned projects which evidence comprehensive community planning for redesign of the local education system. Second priority is given to projects which focus on Statewide needs such as the improvement of reading. In Arizona, more schools were able to participate under revised title II relative need criteria when the number of resources per pupil was raised from 10 to 15. The minimum basic grants were also raised to $325 and $425.

The California State Department of Education removed the 25 percent expenditure limitation for audiovisual materials on its ESEA title II Phase I project applications, thus providing more flexibility, especially for those districts in which schools have met or are approaching standards for printed materials. Hawaii changed its title II relative need criteria and distribution formula to reserve funds for special projects developed with a management by objective approach. The applications require very careful planning involving school librarians, teachers, administrators, curriculum specialists, as well as project objectives and expected outcomes, and methods of measuring the results of the use of the materials acquired.

No changes occurred in the relative need formula in the Oregon Board of Education's State plan for ESEA title II, but changes were taken in the focus of the program. To be consistent with State policy, all title II projects must fit into a local educational agency plan to improve reading competencies through well-selected instructional materials in the Oregon Board of Education's five priority areas: primary education development; improvement of education for the disadvantaged; adding the fourth "R" -- responsibility; career education development; and extending educational opportunity.

No adjustments were required in the relative need criteria and formula for the title II program in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, but changes in areas of emphasis were brought about by planning activities. The ESEA title II administrator participated in comprehensive planning meetings which took place almost weekly during the year and was thus able to relate planning for the management of the program closely to overall agency planning.

Emphasis in the Bureau of Indian Affairs title II program was shifted to focus on support for curriculum projects in schools placing special emphasis on specific target groups -- handicapped children, bilingual children, and children with reading difficulties.

Use of Advisory Committees

Forty-one States established title II advisory committees for the purpose of serving the State agency administering the State plan. Representatives of public and private schools were included on these committees and involved in ascertaining needs, designing effective methods for making materials available, and reaching general acceptance and understanding of the program.

Examples of the type of activity in which title II advisory committees were engaged are cited below:

- New Hampshire held a successful meeting of the title II advisory committee in the spring of 1971. Title II staff reported on the number of projects received and approved, the changing patterns in acquisitions, and the special projects. Committee members reacted to the title II program over the 4-year period, and the effect title II has had on relationships between public and private school personnel. A planning session for administration of the program in 1972 included suggestions for changes in the relative need formula, continuing need for categorical aid for school library materials, and the impact of title II on maintenance of effort. Opportunity was also provided for reaction to a proposed bill banning all sex education in the public schools. Discussion centered primarily around the implications for school libraries and library materials.

- In New Jersey the advisory committee was active in the development of the demonstration aspect of the title II program. A sub-committee worked on criteria for the identification of media programs for consideration as demonstration sites and then helped in selection of the 23 sites.

- The Delaware advisory committee studied the relative need formula and recommended that the same formula be maintained as it was felt that it continued to reflect needs accurately.

Advisory committees in Iowa and Ohio were active during the year. The Iowa committee polled its members and the directors of the 16 centers about possible changes in the relative need formula. One member of the Iowa committee was appointed to represent the nonpublic elementary and secondary schools. The Ohio committee recommended that ESEA title II funds be expended solely for school library resources at the elementary level unless a district pleads a case for aid to junior and senior high schools, and that State Department of Education staff develop a new relative need formula.

California title II staff and the advisory committee studied redirection of the program in the State. They decided not to change the relative need formula for the present, but removed the 25 percent restriction on acquisition of audiovisual materials. On the recommendation of the committee, the feasibility of modifying the Phase II (special-purpose grant) program is being studied.

One of the significant actions of Oregon's ESEA title II advisory committee during the year was to recommend that program objectives be made consistent with State Board of Education objectives. Their recommendation was followed. Washington State's ESEA title II advisory committee met twice during the year to consider the relative need criteria and formulas developed by the State agency in order to redirect the program to new needs and/or priorities. Decisions reached will be implemented in fiscal year 1972.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has a newly established Bureauwide advisory committee on library services, including the title II program.

Expenditures

a. State Administration

The percent of total expenditures reported for State administration of the title II program in fiscal year 1971 was 4.1, somewhat less than the amount actually available (Table 1). Five percent of the amount paid to the State under the title or $50,000, whichever is greater, is the amount available. The $3.2 million expended for State administration in fiscal year 1971 compares with $1.9 million, $3.8 million, $4.4 million, $3.0 million, and $2.4 million expended in fiscal years 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, and 1970, respectively. These figures indicate that State departments of education continue to spend conservatively in the administration of title II, reserving funds as much as possible for the acquisition of instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools.

The distribution of funds expended for State administration of title II by object of expenditures is shown in Table 2. Predictably, the largest proportion -- $2.2 million or 68.6 percent -- went for salaries. The next largest proportion went for unexplained miscellaneous expenditures (column 5). Contracted services took $180,928, equipment $55,666, and indirect costs $40,842.

Out of administrative funds, 12 States -- Delaware, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, Oregon, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin -- make appropriate amounts available

Table 1. Funds available and funds expended for acquisition and State administration, percent of total expenditures for administration, percent of allotment expended and funds carried over under ESEA title II: Fiscal year 1971

State or other area (1)	Allotment (2)	Acquisitions (3)	State Administration (4)	Total Expenditures (5)	Percent Expenditures for State Administration (6)	Percent of Allotment Expended (7)	Carryover (8)	
Total	$80,000,000	$67,343,321	$3,281,932	$70,625,247	4.1	88.28	$9,374,753	
ALABAMA	1,321,780	1,251,397	64,865	1,316,262	4.9	99.58	5,518	
ALASKA	113,378	98,050	7,537	105,587	6.6	93.12	7,791	
ARIZONA	680,887	521,512	10,467	531,979	1.5	78.13	148,908	
ARKANSAS	715,848	193,982	36,886	230,868	5.2	32.25	484,980	
CALIFORNIA	7,682,559	7,297,566	274,166	7,571,732	3.6	98.55	110,827	
COLORADO	870,323	816,901	43,776	860,677	5.0	98.89	9,646	
CONNECTICUT	1,149,723	1,073,615	36,032	1,109,647	0.3	96.51	40,076	
DELAWARE	220,873	170,774	22,840	193,614	10.3	87.65	27,259	
FLORIDA	2,217,472	1,927,522	97,647	2,025,169	4.4	91.32	192,303	
GEORGIA	1,738,192	1,612,040	33,346	1,645,386	1.9	94.66	92,806	
HAWAII	307,834	247,293	34,716	282,009	11.3	91.61	25,825	
IDAHO	288,111	242,127	39,638	281,765	13.8	97.79	6,340	
ILLINOIS	4,275,978	4,148,648	108,627	4,257,275	2.5	99.56	18,703	
INDIANA	2,052,751	1,927,825	44,773	1,972,598	2.2	96.09	80,153	
IOWA	1,153,382	1,098,460	54,922	1,153,382	4.8	100.0	-0-	
KANSAS	875,502	815,156	40,269	855,425	4.6	97.70	20,077	
KENTUCKY	1,206,827	1,156,832	50,000	1,206,827	4.1	100.00	-0-	
LOUISIANA	1,531,433	1,432,660	33,874	1,466,534	2.2	95.76	64,899	
MAINE	401,930	351,287	27,573	378,860	6.9	94.26	23,070	
MARYLAND	1,516,369	1,378,687	49,014	1,427,701	3.2	94.15	88,668	
MASSACHUSETTS	2,076,448	1,948,644	97,936	2,046,580	4.7	98.56	29,868	
MICHIGAN	3,765,418	1,647,942	171,664	1,819,606	4.6	48.32	1,945,812	
MINNESOTA	1,606,455	1,524,807	32,147	1,556,954	2.0	96.31	49,501	
MISSISSIPPI	925,097	827,370	50,000	922,370	5.4	99.70	2,727	
MISSOURI	1,872,834	1,779,066	43,264	1,822,330	2.3	97.30	50,504	
MONTANA	292,635	-0-	24,305	24,305	8.3	8.30	268,330	
NEBRASKA	589,323	500,948	77,007	577,955	7.1	98.07	11,368	
NEVADA	188,527	163,374	11,210	174,584	5.9	92.60	13,943	
NEW HAMPSHIRE	274,924	131,462	22,631	154,093	8.2	56.04	120,831	
NEW JERSEY	2,648,053	2,215,197	132,403	2,347,600	5.0	88.65	300,453	
NEW MEXICO	453,791	378,984	28,705	407,689	6.3	89.84	46,102	
NEW YORK	6,522,557	4,244,876	236,206	4,481,082	3.6	68.70	2,041,475	
NORTH CAROLINA	1,869,699	1,538,585	64,563	1,603,148	3.5	85.74	266,551	
NORTH DAKOTA	256,567	214,142	32,288	246,430	12.6	96.04	10,137	
OHIO	4,205,569	3,572,828	106,431	3,679,259	2.5	87.48	526,310	
OKLAHOMA	954,862	876,317	75,787	952,104	7.9	99.71	2,758	
OREGON	803,112	756,933	46,179	803,112	5.8	100.0	-0-	
PENNSYLVANIA	4,402,757	4,160,212	220,137	4,380,349	5.0	99.49	22,408	
RHODE ISLAND	338,494	266,983	30,327	297,310	9.0	87.83	41,184	
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,020,771	872,121	44,300	916,421	4.3	89.77	104,350	
SOUTH DAKOTA	283,393	183,393	20,411	203,804	7.2	71.91	79,589	
TENNESSEE	1,409,054	1,327,230	45,954	1,373,184	3.3	97.45	35,870	
TEXAS	4,383,968	3,629,020	199,116	3,828,136	4.5	87.54	555,832	
UTAH	471,954	421,323	48,227	469,550	10.2	99.49	2,404	
VERMONT	177,680	150,004	26,632	176,636	15.0	99.41	1,044	
VIRGINIA	1,712,879	1,451,296	19,811	1,471,107	1.2	85.88	241,772	
WASHINGTON	1,320,448	1,257,570	53,228	1,310,798	4.0	99.26	9,650	
WEST VIRGINIA	650,730	17,738	36,210	53,948	5.6	8.29	596,782	
WISCONSIN	1,849,342	1,423,808	67,147	1,490,955	3.6	80.62	358,387	
WYOMING	137,939	103,985	25,906	129,891	18.8	94.16	8,048	
AMERICAN SAMOA	30,000	22,636	690	23,326	2.3	77.75	6,674	
TRUST TERRITORY	75,659	65,938	1,962	67,900	2.6	89.74	7,759	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	262,348	142,708	31,470	174,178	12.0	66.39	88,170	
GUAM	58,884	48,479	7,119	55,598	12.1	94.41	3,280	
PUERTO RICO	1,634,564	1,552,835	39,317	1,592,152	2.4	97.40	42,412	
*VIRGIN ISLANDS	34,880	-0-	274	274	7.8	0.78	34,606	
Bureau of Indian Affairs	117,233	117,233	-0-	117,233	0.0	100.0	-0-	

*Estimated

Table 2. Cost of State administration under ESEA title II, by object of expenditures: Fiscal year 1971

State or other area (1)	Salaries (2)	Contracted Services (3)	Equipment (4)	Other Expenses (5)	Indirect Costs (6)	Funds Transferred To LEA's for Assigned Functions (7)	Grand Total (Cols. 2+7) (8)	
Total	$2,251,264	$180,928	$55,666	$669,611	$40,842	$83,621	$3,281,932	
ALABAMA	47,782	-0-	716	16,367	-0-	-0-	64,865	
ALASKA	3,218	-0-	-0-	4,319	-0-	-0-	7,537	
ARIZONA	7,965	80	-0-	2,422	-0-	-0-	10,467	
ARKANSAS	25,444	-0-	144	11,298	-0-	-0-	36,886	
CALIFORNIA	178,848	18,735	330	58,718	17,535	-0-	274,166	
COLORADO	36,289	187	214	7,086	-0-	-0-	43,776	
CONNECTICUT	22,646	-0-	175	11,939	1,272	-0-	36,032	
DELAWARE	5,506	3,006	3,758	2,822	-0-	7,748	22,840	
FLORIDA	93,638	923	-0-	3,086	-0-	-0-	97,647	
GEORGIA	25,375	-0-	486	7,485	-0-	-0-	33,346	
HAWAII	24,125	-0-	76	10,515	-0-	-0-	34,716	
IDAHO	29,695	-0-	190	9,753	-0-	-0-	39,638	
ILLINOIS	98,286	7	19	10,315	-0-	-0-	108,627	
INDIANA	29,334	135	-0-	13,990	-0-	1,314	44,773	
IOWA	35,384	9,470	685	3,840	-0-	5,543	54,992	
KANSAS	26,521	-0-	257	13,491	-0-	-0-	40,269	
KENTUCKY	42,414	-0-	84	7,502	-0-	-0-	50,000	
LOUISIANA	14,838	-0-	3,785	12,251	-0-	-0-	33,874	
MAINE	11,817	8,530	503	6,723	-0-	-0-	27,573	
MARYLAND	38,190	1,132	-0-	9,692	-0-	-0-	49,014	
MASSACHUSETTS	61,913	19,082	777	16,164	-0-	-0-	97,936	
MICHIGAN	87,489	-0-	-0-	74,175	-0-	10,000	171,664	
MINNESOTA	8,557	4,176	13,403	6,011	-0-	-0-	32,147	
MISSISSIPPI	26,865	12,212	2,424	8,499	-0-	-0-	50,000	
MISSOURI	30,890	160	635	4,929	-0-	6,650	43,264	
MONTANA	10,961	421	1	12,922	-0-	-0-	24,305	
NEBRASKA	52,753	7,528	1,843	14,883	-0-	-0-	41,792	
NEVADA	4,406	-0-	-0-	6,754	-0-	50	11,210	
NEW HAMPSHIRE	18,382	902	200	3,147	-0-	-0-	22,631	
NEW JERSEY	70,481	-0-	1,400	18,795	-0-	41,727	132,403	
NEW MEXICO	17,616	3,480	665	6,944	-0-	-0-	28,705	
NEW YORK	167,330	58,184	-0-	10,692	-0-	-0-	236,206	
NORTH CAROLINA	40,345	7,800	1,116	15,302	-0-	-0-	64,563	
NORTH DAKOTA	21,901	2,971	192	6,199	-0-	1,025	32,288	
OHIO	83,861	4,776	1,595	16,199	-0-	-0-	106,431	
OKLAHOMA	42,205	100	2,305	22,108	9,069	-0-	75,787	
OREGON	28,642	-0-	105	2,966	11,242	3,224	46,179	
PENNSYLVANIA	151,334	7,169	2,841	58,793	-0-	-0-	220,137	
RHODE ISLAND	19,647	-0-	2,331	8,349	-0-	-0-	30,327	
SOUTH CAROLINA	40,995	-0-	-0-	3,305	-0-	-0-	44,300	
SOUTH DAKOTA	15,513	312	1,045	3,357	184	-0-	20,411	
TENNESSEE	40,261	-0-	616	5,077	-0-	-0-	45,954	
* TEXAS	149,322	3,180	4,819	41,795	-0-	-0-	199,116	
UTAH	31,311	600	336	13,230	-0-	2,750	48,227	
VERMONT	18,162	-0-	-0-	8,470	-0-	-0-	26,632	
VIRGINIA	17,935	-0-	-0-	1,876	-0-	-0-	19,811	
WASHINGTON	40,678	1,857	1,051	7,142	-0-	2,500	53,228	
WEST VIRGINIA	29,896	-0-	-0-	5,974	-0-	340	36,210	
WISCONSIN	40,427	1,250	219	24,501	-0-	750	67,147	
WYOMING	19,813	-0-	150	5,093	850	-0-	25,906	
AMERICAN SAMOA	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	690	-0-	690	
TRUST TERRITORY	-0-	-0-	-0-	1,962	-0-	-0-	1,962	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	30,289	1,181	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	31,470	
GUAM	1,977	-0-	4,175	967	-0-	-0-	7,119	
PUERTO RICO	31,792	1,382	-0-	6,143	-0-	-0-	39,317	
* VIRGIN ISLANDS	-0-	-0-	-0-	274	-0-	-0-	274	
Bureau of Indian Affairs	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	

*Estimated

to local education agencies for the distribution and control of materials acquired under title II. In fiscal year 1971, this amounted to $83,621 or 2.6 percent of the total expended for administration.

b. State Personnel

Table 3 provides data on the number of administrators, supervisors, clerical and secretarial staff, and other positions assigned in State departments of education to administer the title II program in fiscal year 1971. Slightly more than 292 positions (in full-time equivalents) were reported in fiscal year 1971, an increase from about 85 positions in fiscal year 1970. The increase undoubtedly reflects the increased appropriation for title II, from $42.5 million in 1970 to $80 million in 1971. The sharp reduction in funds available for the program in fiscal years 1969 and 1970 caused many States to lose positions, and they are only now beginning to build back toward the level of the early years of the title II program.

The number of administrators assigned to title II programs has remained fairly constant. The loss of staff is most serious in the supervisory and clerical categories. There were, for example, 126 total full-time supervisors assigned to title II in fiscal year 1968 compared with about 53 in fiscal year 1971. Such supervisors include school library specialists, audiovisual specialists, and curriculum and subject supervisors. Supervisory personnel assigned to title II give valuable assistance to program activities such as those involving assessment of resources, development and revision of standards, selection and use of materials, short and long range planning for instructional materials and school media center development, and inservice training. Loss of such personnel frequently means that allotment to local education agencies continues but little direction and leadership for the full development of media services in instructional programs is given.

Although the 159 secretarial and clerical positions account for about 54 percent of total staff, the difference in the number of such positions from fiscal year 1968 is over 69. The remaining 22 positions include consultants, other State staff in research and evaluation, members of advisory committees, fiscal and statistical personnel, and nonprofessional employees such as truck drivers and technicians who do not fall into the category.

c. Acquisition

Among the three categories of eligible materials -- (1) school library resources, (2) textbooks, and (3) other instructional materials -- the States continued in fiscal year 1971 to give priority to the first (Table 4). The $59.4 million shown in Column 1 as spent for school

Table 3. Number of State department of education personnel assigned to ESEA title II programs. Fiscal year 1971

State or other area (1)	Administrators (2)	Supervisors (3)	Secretarial Clerical Staff (4)	Other (5)	Total (6)			
Total	57.3	53.6	159.1	22.3	292.3			
ALABAMA	0.6	1.4	3.0	0.8	5.8			
ALASKA	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.4			
ARIZONA	0.5	0.0	1.9	0.0	2.4			
ARKANSAS	1.2	0.2	1.8	0.1	3.3			
CALIFORNIA	1.0	0.0	5.5	7.4	13.9			
COLORADO	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.0	4.0			
CONNECTICUT	1.0	0.0	2.0	1.0	4.0			
DELAWARE	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0			
FLORIDA	2.8	0.0	1.5	1.0	5.3			
GEORGIA	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0			
HAWAII	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.0			
IDAHO	0.5	1.5	1.5	0.0	3.5			
ILLINOIS	4.2	7.7	14.6	0.0	26.5			
INDIANA	3.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	4.0			
IOWA	1.0	1.2	2.0	1.0	5.2			
KANSAS	0.5	1.0	2.0	0.0	3.5			
KENTUCKY	1.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	6.0			
LOUISIANA	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	3.0			
MAINE	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	3.0			
MARYLAND	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	3.0			
MASSACHUSETTS	1.0	2.0	4.0	2.1	9.1			
MICHIGAN	1.0	5.0	2.0	0.0	8.0			
MINNESOTA	0.5	1.0	2.0	0.5	4.0			
MISSISSIPPI	0.0	1.0	3.2	0.3	4.5			
MISSOURI	1.1	1.0	2.1	0.0	4.2			
MONTANA	0.3	0.0	1.3	0.0	1.6			
NEBRASKA	2.0	1.1	2.2	0.5	5.8			
NEVADA	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.8			
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.3	2.3			
NEW JERSEY	0.0	1.1	11.1	0.0	12.2			
NEW MEXICO	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0			
NEW YORK	6.0	1.0	10.0	0.0	17.0			
NORTH CAROLINA	1.3	0.0	6.3	0.5	8.1			
NORTH DAKOTA	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.0			
OHIO	1.3	3.0	4.2	0.0	8.5			
OKLAHOMA	2.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	3.8			
OREGON	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.0	2.5			
PENNSYLVANIA	1.0	3.0	9.0	0.0	13.0			
RHODE ISLAND	1.2	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.2			
SOUTH CAROLINA	0.0	2.8	3.0	0.0	5.8			
SOUTH DAKOTA	0.0	1.0	0.5	0.0	1.5			
TENNESSEE	0.0	3.0	1.0	0.0	4.0			
TEXAS	7.7	0.0	9.5	0.0	17.2			
UTAH	0.0	1.0	3.0	0.0	4.0			
VERMONT	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	2.0			
VIRGINIA	0.5	1.0	1.0	0.0	2.5			
WASHINGTON	0.5	0.7	0.9	2.4	4.5			
WEST VIRGINIA	1.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	5.0			
WISCONSIN	1.0	1.0	4.0	0.0	6.0			
WYOMING	0.1	1.0	1.1	0.0	2.2			
AMERICAN SAMOA	0.2	0.7	1.0	0.3	2.2			
TRUST TERRITORY	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.0	1.0			
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	3.0			
GUAM	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0			
PUERTO RICO	1.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	6.0			
* VIRGIN ISLANDS	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
Bureau of Indian Affairs	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.1	1.0			

*Estimated

Table 4. Cost of school library resources, textbooks and other instructional materials acquired for loan to children and teachers; costs of ordering, cataloging, processing, and delivering materials; and percent of total acquisitions expended in each category under ESEA title II: Fiscal year 1971

State or other area	School Library Resources		Textbooks		Other Instructional Materials		Ordering, Processing, Cataloging and Delivery		Total Acquisitions (Cols. 2+4+6+8)
	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Total	$59,499,500	88.4	$1,076,007	1.6	$4,110,341	6.1	$2,657,473	3.9	$67,343,321
ALABAMA	1,088,603	87.0	11,813	0.9	119,768	9.6	31,213	2.5	1,251,397
ALASKA	92,295	94.1	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	5,755	5.9	98,050
ARIZONA	472,959	90.7	-0-	0.0	48,553	9.3	-0-	0.0	521,512
ARKANSAS	193,982	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	193,982
CALIFORNIA	6,339,464	86.9	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	958,102	13.1	7,297,566
COLORADO	509,642	62.4	-0-	0.0	257,337	31.5	49,922	6.1	816,901
CONNECTICUT	1,071,151	99.8	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	2,464	0.2	1,073,615
DELAWARE	158,714	92.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	12,060	7.1	170,774
FLORIDA	1,807,729	93.8	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	119,793	6.2	1,927,522
GEORGIA	1,501,130	93.1	14,319	0.9	3,150	0.2	93,441	5.8	1,612,040
HAWAII	235,419	95.2	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	11,874	4.8	247,293
IDAHO	180,100	74.4	-0-	0.0	56,841	23.5	5,186	2.1	242,127
ILLINOIS	3,990,674	96.2	-0-	0.0	12[illegible],526	3.1	28,448	0.7	4,148,648
INDIANA	1,756,400	91.1	-0-	0.0	55,135	2.9	116,290	6.0	1,927,825
IOWA	1,035,671	94.3	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	62,789	5.7	1,098,460
KANSAS	777,167	95.3	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	37,989	4.7	815,156
KENTUCKY	1,021,354	88.3	68,690	5.9	28,043	2.4	38,745	3.4	1,156,832
LOUISIANA	1,374,288	95.9	17,779	1.3	-0-	0.0	40,593	2.8	1,432,660
MAINE	316,728	90.2	-0-	0.0	27,704	7.9	6,855	1.9	351,287
MARYLAND	1,300,610	94.3	1,149	0.1	68,451	5.0	8,477	0.6	1,378,687
MASSACHUSETTS	1,744,360	89.5	113,080	5.8	-0-	0.0	91,204	4.7	1,948,644
MICHIGAN	1,390,743	84.4	18,971	1.1	217,263	13.2	20,965	1.3	1,647,942
MINNESOTA	1,440,943	94.5	-0-	0.0	38,120	2.5	45,744	3.0	1,524,807
MISSISSIPPI	703,363	80.6	-0-	0.0	132,291	15.2	36,716	4.2	872,370
MISSOURI	1,709,973	96.1	422	0.0	-0-	0.0	68,671	3.9	1,779,066
MONTANA	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
NEBRASKA	478,167	95.5	-0-	0.0	3,616	0.7	19,165	3.8	500,948
NEVADA	150,479	92.1	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	12,895	7.9	163,374
NEW HAMPSHIRE	95,144	72.4	13,450	10.2	18,462	14.0	4,406	3.4	131,462
NEW JERSEY	2,194,320	99.1	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	20,877	0.9	2,215,197
NEW MEXICO	254,374	67.1	43,432	11.5	69,203	18.3	11,975	3.1	378,984
NEW YORK	3,899,243	91.9	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	345,633	8.1	4,244,876
NORTH CAROLINA	1,511,954	98.3	236	0.0	6,957	0.4	19,438	1.3	1,538,585
NORTH DAKOTA	214,142	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	214,142
OHIO	3,393,332	95.0	77,796	2.2	63,783	1.8	37,917	1.0	3,572,828
OKLAHOMA	866,953	98.9	-0-	0.0	125	0.0	9,239	1.1	876,317
OREGON	756,933	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	756,933
PENNSYLVANIA	2,030,760	48.8	42,060	1.0	2,087,392	50.2	-0-	0.0	4,160,212
RHODE ISLAND	243,167	91.1	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	23,816	8.9	266,983
SOUTH CAROLINA	817,208	93.7	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	54,913	6.3	872,121
SOUTH DAKOTA	144,147	78.6	-0-	0.0	37,962	20.7	1,284	0.7	183,393
TENNESSEE	1,235,963	93.1	40,356	3.1	-0-	0.0	50,911	3.8	1,327,230
TEXAS	3,576,762	98.6	15,968	0.4	-0-	0.0	36,290	1.0	3,629,020
UTAH	375,212	89.1	46,111	10.9	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	421,323
VERMONT	150,004	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	150,004
VIRGINIA	1,430,384	98.6	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	20,912	1.4	1,451,296
WASHINGTON	1,152,511	91.6	-0-	0.0	36,488	2.9	68,571	5.5	1,257,570
WEST VIRGINIA	17,434	98.3	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	304	1.7	17,738
WISCONSIN	1,198,129	84.2	8,642	0.6	196,810	13.8	20,227	1.4	1,423,808
WYOMING	92,631	89.1	75	0.0	11,186	10.8	93	0.1	103,985
AMERICAN SAMOA	22,562	99.7	74	0.3	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	22,636
TRUST TERRITORY	38,223	58.0	18,524	28.1	3,880	5.9	5,311	8.0	65,938
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	142,708	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	142,708
GUAM	48,479	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	48,479
PUERTO RICO	637,480	41.0	523,060	33.7	392,295	25.3	-0-	0.0	1,552,835
*VIRGIN ISLANDS	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Bureau of Indian Affairs	117,233	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	117,233

*Estimated

library resources is 88.4 percent of the entire amount spent for acquisitions. Other instructional materials (the same items identified as school library resources, but not cataloged and processed) took 6.1 percent, and textbooks accounted for 1.6 percent. As compared with previous years, the percentage of funds spent for other instructional materials has risen, while the percent spent for textbooks has declined.

Sixteen States, the District of Columbia, and Guam purchased school library resources only. Puerto Rico and six States -- Colorado, Idaho, Mississippi, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, and South Dakota -- allotted more than 15 percent of acquisition funds to other instructional materials. In several of these States, there are large numbers of elementary schools without centralized media centers.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico spent a much larger proportion of title II funds for textbooks than any other State or outlying area. (Table 4, column 5) In both of these areas, teaching presents unusual linguistic problems, and there is a great need for specialized text materials. Three States -- New Hampshire, New Mexico, and Utah -- expended slightly over 10 percent of title II acquisitions funds for textbooks. The somewhat higher than average expenditure in these States is accounted for by great need for bilingual textbooks and for new textbooks for experimental programs.

In fiscal year 1971, State departments of education reported spending $2.6 million for ordering, processing, cataloging, and delivering services (Table 4, column 8). In some States, these costs were not reported separately from acquisitions, so the actual amount expended for these services is probably considerably higher than the figure reported. The small amount expended indicates that much of the charge for these services continued to be absorbed by local education agencies, leaving more title II funds for buying materials.

Eight States -- Arizona, Arkansas, Montana, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, and Vermont -- the District of Columbia, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and four of the five outlying areas reported no expenditures for ordering, processing, cataloging, and delivering services in fiscal year 1971.

Tables 5 and 6 show the cost of acquired items defined as school library resources and other instructional materials. Of the $59.4 million expended for school library resources, library books account for 61.6 percent and audiovisual materials for 36 percent. The proportion of funds spent for cataloged and processed audiovisual materials has risen slowly but steadily over the 6 years of the title II program, with increased audiovisual materials enabling pupils and teachers to make a multimedia approach to teaching and learning. In fiscal year

Table 5. Cost of library books, periodicals, other printed materials, and audiovisual materials loaned to children and teachers as school library resources under ESEA title II and percent of total for each type of material: Fiscal year 1971

State or other area	Books		Periodicals		Other Printed Materials		Audiovisual Materials		Total Acquisitions (Cols.2+4+6+8)
	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Total	$36,623,625	61.6	$750,983	1.3	$675,397	1.1	$21,449,495	36.0	$59,499,500
ALABAMA	737,444	67.7	22,621	2.1	9,230	0.9	319,308	29.3	1,088,603
ALASKA	50,462	54.7	2,428	2.6	4,693	5.1	34,712	27.6	92,295
ARIZONA	279,843	59.2	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	193,116	40.8	472,959
ARKANSAS	178,882	92.2	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	15,100	7.8	193,982
CALIFORNIA	4,120,356	65.0	185,297	2.9	72,604	1.2	1,961,207	30.9	6,339,464
COLORADO	329,145	64.6	4,296	0.8	-0-	0.0	176,201	34.6	509,642
CONNECTICUT	461,125	43.0	24,156	2.3	-0-	0.0	585,870	54.7	1,071,151
DELAWARE	80,982	51.0	853	0.5	2,637	1.7	74,242	46.8	158,714
FLORIDA	1,058,571	58.5	7,500	0.4	15,426	0.9	726,232	40.2	1,807,729
GEORGIA	1,453,403	96.8	7,671	0.5	268	0.0	39,788	2.7	1,501,130
HAWAII	79,997	34.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	155,422	66.0	235,419
IDAHO	127,416	70.7	3,023	1.7	3,210	1.8	46,451	25.8	180,100
ILLINOIS	1,982,098	49.7	72,465	1.8	51,238	1.3	1,884,873	47.2	3,990,674
INDIANA	865,930	49.3	21,366	1.2	69,876	4.0	799,228	45.5	1,756,400
IOWA	257,251	24.8	10,827	1.1	-0-	0.0	767,593	74.1	1,035,671
KANSAS	313,419	40.3	3,691	0.5	1,203	0.2	458,854	59.0	777,167
KENTUCKY	650,902	63.7	12,830	1.3	2,658	0.3	354,964	34.7	1,021,354
LOUISIANA	923,700	67.2	8,289	0.6	8,374	0.6	433,925	31.6	1,374,288
MAINE	207,159	65.4	2,614	0.8	1,126	0.4	105,829	33.4	316,728
MARYLAND	778,864	59.9	2,663	0.2	3,457	0.3	515,626	39.6	1,300,610
MASSACHUSETTS	874,077	50.1	15,257	0.9	54,589	3.1	800,437	45.9	1,744,360
MICHIGAN	752,077	54.1	9,079	0.6	27,406	2.0	602,181	43.3	1,390,743
MINNESOTA	1,058,216	73.4	-0-	0.0	1,525	0.1	381,202	26.5	1,440,943
MISSISSIPPI	703,363	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	703,363
MISSOURI	1,227,489	71.8	8,540	0.5	27,398	1.6	446,546	26.1	1,709,973
MONTANA	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
NEBRASKA	213,822	44.7	4,274	0.9	27,561	5.8	232,510	48.6	478,167
NEVADA	104,063	69.2	123	0.1	30	0.0	46,263	30.7	150,479
NEW HAMPSHIRE	95,144	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	95,144
NEW JERSEY	1,043,779	47.6	35,897	1.6	-0-	0.0	1,114,644	50.8	2,194,320
NEW MEXICO	168,155	66.1	1,137	0.5	1,326	0.5	83,756	32.9	254,374
NEW YORK	1,957,328	50.2	57,337	1.5	84,052	2.1	1,800,526	46.2	3,899,243
NORTH CAROLINA	749,044	49.5	9,578	0.6	11,638	0.8	741,694	49.1	1,511,954
NORTH DAKOTA	149,566	69.9	1,104	0.5	2,449	0.1	61,023	28.5	214,142
OHIO	2,366,019	69.7	42,980	1.3	40,494	1.2	943,839	27.8	3,393,332
OKLAHOMA	593,516	68.5	17,446	2.0	34,060	3.9	221,931	25.6	866,953
OREGON	328,331	43.4	6,834	0.9	16,803	2.2	404,965	53.5	756,933
PENNSYLVANIA	2,028,494	99.9	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	2,266	0.1	2,030,760
RHODE ISLAND	124,759	51.3	330	0.1	423	0.2	117,655	48.4	243,167
SOUTH CAROLINA	647,485	79.2	14,743	1.8	-0-	0.0	154,980	19.0	817,208
SOUTH DAKOTA	144,147	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	144,147
TENNESSEE	946,809	76.6	-0-	0.0	27,844	2.3	261,310	21.1	1,235,963
TEXAS	2,591,846	72.5	28,306	0.8	8,710	0.2	947,900	26.5	3,576,762
UTAH	117,959	31.4	18,794	5.0	-0-	0.0	238,459	68.6	375,212
VERMONT	103,567	69.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	46,437	31.0	150,004
VIRGINIA	854,210	59.7	20,083	1.4	7,708	0.5	548,383	38.4	1,430,384
WASHINGTON	464,215	40.3	16,260	1.4	20,873	1.8	651,163	56.5	1,152,511
WEST VIRGINIA	10,528	60.4	359	2.1	873	5.0	5,674	32.5	17,434
WISCONSIN	329,687	27.5	8,275	0.7	26,602	2.2	833,565	69.6	1,198,129
WYOMING	72,475	78.2	68	0.1	526	0.6	19,562	21.1	92,631
AMERICAN SAMOA	22,562	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	22,562
TRUST TERRITORY	23,988	62.8	2,881	7.5	-0-	0.0	11,354	29.7	38,223
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	91,286	64.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	51,422	36.0	142,708
GUAM	48,479	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	48,479
PUERTO RICO	609,852	95.7	26,985	4.2	643	0.1	-0-	0.0	637,480
*VIRGIN ISLANDS	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Bureau of Indian Affairs	70,339	60.0	11,723	10.0	5,864	5.0	29,307	25.0	117,233

*Estimated

Table 6: Cost of trade books, periodicals, other printed materials, and audiovisual materials loaned to children and teachers as other instructional materials under ESEA title II and percent of total for each type of material: Fiscal year 1971

State or other area	Books		Periodicals		Other Printed Materials		Audiovisual Materials		Total Acquisitions (Cols. 2+4+6+8)
	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Total	$1,723,446	41.9	$55,025	1.4	$144,189	3.5	$2,187,681	53.2	$4,110,341
ALABAMA	88,587	74.0	1,555	1.3	2,466	2.0	27,160	22.7	119,768
ALASKA	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
ARIZONA	19,818	40.8	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	28,735	59.[illegible]	48,553
ARKANSAS	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
CALIFORNIA	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
COLORADO	35,755	14.0	1,249	0.4	-0-	0.0	220,333	85.6	257,337
CONNECTICUT	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
DELAWARE	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
FLORIDA	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
GEORGIA	1,244	39.5	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	1,906	60.5	3,150
HAWAII	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
IDAHO	23,301	41.0	1,180	2.1	8,026	14.1	24,334	42.8	56,841
ILLINOIS	36,352	28.1	4,064	3.1	12,509	9.7	76,601	59.1	129,526
INDIANA	30,445	55.2	1,101	2.0	2,884	5.2	20,705	37.6	55,135
IOWA	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
KANSAS	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
KENTUCKY	21,345	76.1	188	0.7	-0-	0.0	6,510	23.2	28,042
LOUISIANA	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
MAINE	17,202	62.1	40	0.1	4	0.0	10,458	37.8	27,704
MARYLAND	56,157	82.1	20	0.0	7,122	10.4	5,152	7.5	68,451
MASSACHUSETTS	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
MICHIGAN	39,896	18.4	33,262	15.3	37,379	17.2	106,726	49.1	217,263
MINNESOTA	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	38,120	100.0	38,120
MISSISSIPPI	132,291	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	132,291
MISSOURI	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
MONTANA	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
NEBRASKA	3,060	84.6	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	556	15.4	3,616
NEVADA	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
NEW HAMPSHIRE	18,462	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	18,462
NEW JERSEY	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
NEW MEXICO	22,322	32.3	796	1.1	3,449	5.0	42,636	61.6	69,203
NEW YORK	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
NORTH CAROLINA	350	5.0	-0-	0.0	1,715	24.7	4,892	70.3	6,957
NORTH DAKOTA	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
OHIO	5,565	8.7	680	1.1	48,614	76.2	8,924	14.0	63,783
OKLAHOMA	125	100.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	125
OREGON	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
PENNSYLVANIA	1,081,655	51.8	1,080	0.1	6,207	0.3	998,450	47.8	2,087,392
RHODE ISLAND	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
SOUTH CAROLINA	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
SOUTH DAKOTA	-0-	0.0	3,668	9.7	-0-	0.0	34,294	90.3	37,962
TENNESSEE	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
TEXAS	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
UTAH	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
VERMONT	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
VIRGINIA	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
WASHINGTON	10,886	29.8	330	0.9	1,694	4.7	23,578	64.6	36,488
WEST VIRGINIA	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
WISCONSIN	75,823	38.5	5,761	2.9	11,523	5.9	103,703	52.7	196,810
WYOMING	719	6.4	51	0.5	317	2.8	10,099	90.3	11,186
AMERICAN SAMOA	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
TRUST TERRITORY	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	280	7.2	3,600	92.8	3,880
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
GUAM	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
PUERTO RICO	2,086	0.5	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	390,209	99.5	392,295
*VIRGIN ISLANDS	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-
Bureau of Indian Affairs	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-	0.0	-0-

*Estimated

1971, nine States -- Connecticut, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, New Jersey, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin -- expended 50 percent or more for audiovisual materials in the school library resources category.

Audiovisual materials account for 53.2 percent of the total reported for other instructional materials (Table 6, column 9). This larger proportion spent for audiovisual materials not processed and cataloged is probably due to the fact that in some school districts, audiovisual materials are not made available through school media centers. Altogether, audiovisual materials comprise 35.1 percent of the acquisitions in all categories for fiscal year 1971.

d. Financial Carry-over Provision

The extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act enacted on April 13, 1970 (P.L. 91-230) contained a provision which extended through the succeeding fiscal year the period of time during which appropriated funds could be expended by State departments of education. (Section 405(b) of the General Education Provisions Act). Under the authority of the provision, State departments of education reported a total of $3,298,512 of fiscal year 1970 funds as carried forward to fiscal year 1971 for expenditure. The aggregate of the carry-over reported for fiscal year 1971 funds is $9,374,753.

3. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Technical Assistance in Project Development

School media supervisors and other specialists in some State departments of education have used on-site visits to assist in the development and evaluation of projects under title II in order to relate them to State and local educational and instructional objectives. Since staffing limitations prevented several States from making on-site visits to provide developmental assistance, regional conferences, short briefing sessions, and telephone contact were used to assist with project development. In these cases, priority for on-site visits was given to local education agencies submitting incomplete projects.

Pennsylvania reports that more than 50 on-site visits were made in fiscal year 1971 for the purpose of evaluating materials and programs, and reviewing plans for future growth. In New York, staff assigned to the administration of ESEA title II participated in a cooperative review service or team program reviews conducted in 20 school districts.

Each fall in New Hampshire almost all new buildings or library facilities are visited. Other visits are made to schools at the request of librarians or administrators and opportunity is provided to assess the collection and to discuss with librarians and/or principals its strengths and weaknesses in relation to the curriculum. Each school submitting a request for a special-purpose grant is also visited to consider the project and the materials request in light of the school's program and needs. Four members of the Massachusetts' title II staff visited each of the 52 special-purpose grant recipients in fiscal year 1971. Members of the staff also visited some 600 public, private, and parochial schools in Massachusetts representing a cross section of rural and urban environments, economic conditions, and ethnic backgrounds.

In the Virgin Islands, on-site visits revealed increased efforts by public and non-public school teachers in the area of improvement of reading skills. ESEA title II has helped by providing specialized remedial reading kits and other materials through school media programs and through the title II Centers. Title II personnel, working with reading specialists and supervisors, have assisted in the total project concept. In Alabama, the ESEA title II coordinator spends almost 100 percent of her time in working at the system level and in local schools with project planning and evaluation. In Georgia, staff members visited 94 of the 189 school districts during fiscal year 1971 to assist in comprehensive planning. Title II staff in Maryland made many on-site visits to provide assistance and counsel on project development and to speak on State and local objectives for library media program improvements. In Puerto Rico, personnel from the audiovisual program made about 40 on-site visits to assist in project development and evaluation, and in relating project planning to State objectives. Tennessee and South Carolina used on-site visits to assist in project development and encourage the continued selection and use of high quality instructional materials. Virginia reported that during fiscal year 1971, on-site visitation reached its highest level, chiefly to supply information and to help plan for special projects.

State coordinators in the Upper Midwestern States see the on-site visit as a valuable planning and evaluation tool. For the most part, they responded to requests from public and private schools for consultative help. The large number of school districts coupled with the shortage of State department of education personnel restricted the number of visits. Several States made special efforts to visit districts that have had problems in project development; others, such as Illinois, attempted to visit one-third of the districts each year; most "piggyback" ESEA title II visits while on accreditation teams; several States rely on assistance from general or subject area supervisors' visits.

New Mexico reports that change of emphasis by the State Education Agency has made follow-through on past activities difficult; however, in addition to 66 inservice training sessions, the Library Media Specialist monitored programs in 117 schools.

On-site visits in local districts by accreditation teams, subject consultants, and other Texas State Agency personnel result in referrals to the title II office in instances where special assistance would be appropriate in strengthening the acquisition program under title II.

Staff of the Bureau of Indian Affairs made on-site visits to locations in Alaska, New Mexico, Arizona, and North Dakota to give assistance in title II project development, and to monitor ongoing programs.

Distances in the Trust Territory make on-site visits solely for the purpose of ESEA title II programs very difficult. The Headquarters Education Department staff has, however, attempted to touch upon all current programs when visiting. The most effective counseling takes place during meetings and workshops when those most related to these programs, including ESEA title II, are brought together. These people, in turn, carry home sufficient knowledge to carry out, at least minimally, on-site project planning.

In California, there is heavy emphasis on program objectives and evaluation since all school districts will be required by 1973 to use the Program Planning Budgetary System (PPBS) of accounting. The ESEA title II staff has training in this system and assists school districts during on-site visits and other consultations in the development of media programs. During the on-site visits, staff members are able to meet with all administrative personnel involved in decision making in project development, including the superintendent, the assistant superintendents for curriculum and business, the media personnel, and the building principal. This is a required part of the approval process of the special grant projects and is frequently a part of the on-site visits in the supervision of Phase I.

The Washington State education agency learning resources staff made 54 on-site visits to school districts to work with teachers and librarians in planning, developing, and evaluating title II projects. Many of the Curriculum and Instruction Division supervisors worked with the schools in planning and implementing their programs. Proposal writing workshops and meetings were held, and, in many cases, subject area specialists gave assistance to the districts in writing their proposals during the sessions.

Staff Development Activities

In the administration of ESEA title II, State departments of education provide leadership, supervision, and staff development opportunities to local education personnel who have responsibilities for the administration and use of materials. These programs are conducted to help teachers and media specialists teach and guide students with purpose and direction so that instructional materials acquired under title II can contribute directly to achievement of instructional objectives. Following are some examples of the variety of staff development opportunities related to title II.

> New Jersey: The three media supervisors have been involved in a needs assessment program designed by the Division of Curriculum and Instruction. Local districts spent a year in a self-study program and in the second semester, a team of State department of education staff members and local school personnel spent 4 to 5 days in an on-site evaluation.
>
> New York: The inservice program was planned and executed cooperatively by local school personnel and the team which developed the Right to Read pilot program. Another successful inservice program was designed to prepare both professional and non-professional staff in the local district to develop and begin to carry out educational goals for the 1970's. The title II staff helped in the development of thinking regarding the library's role as a learning resource and vehicle for reaching the newly defined goals.
>
> Massachusetts: Inservice programs were held in each of the five regional offices of the Department. Topics discussed included program, staff, facilities, and selection of materials. Special bibliographies have been developed and distributed.
>
> New Hampshire: Five regional workshops were held, with media facilities the chief program topic. A collection of professional materials is available for loan from the Department. A library newsletter is sent out several times a year to disseminate information on new developments.
>
> Connecticut: Staff assigned to title II spent much time developing programs for professional meetings including All-State Reading Conference. Regional and district meetings were held for school library personnel. Staff members also lectured to a number of college classes.

Virginia planned and implemented an extensive inservice program for both State and local media personnel. State staff members participated in an out-of-state institute concerning the building of school media collections; two staff members visited the Office of Education Materials Center and one staff member attended a conference for book jobbers in New York to learn of new materials available and to study displays and exhibits. Subsequent presentations were made to local groups concerning these conferences. One staff member worked extensively with personnel in rural divisions to improve the quality of library service. Staff members participated in several days of preservice training for library and classroom aides in a county which used its ESEA funds to establish a county-wide media program where there had previously been none. Followup visits to individual schools within the county were made later in the year.

In Alabama the increase in number and use of non-book materials necessitated training programs dealing with the organization of those materials. The District of Columbia held a workshop to acquaint media personnel with the objectives of special-purpose grants and procedures for applying for funds. In Georgia, district conferences were held which placed emphasis on selection and utilization of all type of media, the Right to Read program, and educational accountability; many improvements in school media programs are now evident as a result of these conferences.

The title II ESEA staff in Maryland assisted in planning a full year inservice workshop for Baltimore City media personnel; cooperated with the Adult Services for Public Libraries in a workshop which focused on the use of new media other than 16mm films; arranged for the Educational Technology Center at the University of Maryland to provide an inservice program for secondary school libraries and audiovisual coordinators from one local education agency. In Mississippi, the ESEA title II staff worked in one local education agency for 3 months assisting in evaluating the media services in the district and in formulating long range plans for improvement; long and short range objectives were developed by this process. In another local agency, the staff participated for the third year in a five-year program of systemwide library development.

In Puerto Rico, 18 new media specialists assigned to local school districts to work in the use of educational technology were trained in analysis of instruction so as to be able to recommend, select, design, and produce the most suitable media for learning. These specialists in turn are training teachers and other local school personnel. In South Carolina, teacher aides were included in local meetings on selection and utilization of media. West Virginia staff members sponsored and participated in joint conferences of the State school library organizations with the State audio-visual organizations. In the Virgin Islands, numerous workshops, meetings, and inservice programs were conducted for representatives of public and private schools by ESEA title II staff on the topics of previewing, selection, special project planning, and organization and utilization of title II materials.

Throughout the Upper Midwest, inservice or staff development activities for both State and local media staff were centered on more effective use of media. The topics covered in the third annual series of Educational Telephone Network Broadcasts in Wisconsin best describe this emphasis. "Organizing Media for Accessibility," "Reaching Out for Resources," "Individually Guided Education in the Elementary IMC," "Media In-Service Education for Teachers." Nebraska was pleased with the response from the 13 regional meetings for school and college media personnel and 1-day "hands-on-media" workshops involving almost 1,200 teachers and administrators. Bulletins, annotated lists of new professional tools and publications from the library/media press, and cataloging manuals for audiovisual materials prepared by State personnel were examples of aids sent to local school media personnel.

In cooperation with the Field Services Consultant in the Wyoming State Library, the Media Consultant conducted a series of six workshops. Dealing exclusively with the selection, organization, and use of audiovisual materials, the workshops were one day each, and involved 111 public librarians, 76 school media specialists, and other interested persons. Inservice education is provided by the State department of education to teachers and subject consultants by the Media Consultant. This inservice education involves new methods and teaching techniques, many of which utilize various types of media. On-site visitations are made for the purpose of planning, and providing assistance in organization problems, administration, selection activities, building or remodelling plans, program ideas, and for work with teachers. These activities are usually on a one-to-one basis, or with small groups, and involve media personnel, administrators, and teachers.

In Colorado, personnel in the Pueblo School District have received continuing consultative services at the junior and senior high school levels in planning open concept educational facilities incorporating library-resources centers and the selection of materials with special emphasis on filmstrips and records for junior high. An example of the inservice programs provided was a workshop held August 10-14 in Canon City; it provided programs for the school library personnel on the selection, organization, and use of materials, many of which are acquired under the title II program.

The Idaho State School Media Consultant visited approximately 200 schools in 52 of the 115 school districts. These visitations ranged from a brief overview of media services to 2 days intensive consultation, according to need, on selection, organization, and utilization of materials. Requests ranged from work simplification programs to methods for transforming an ineffective elementary school library into a learning resource center. Seven media workshops were conducted in Montana to assist school media personnel in selection, organization, and use of instructional materials.

Workshops for library personnel continue to be held at least annually in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Selection, organization, and use of materials acquired under ESEA title II are always major items on the agenda of the sessions.

One session of the Department of the Interior's annual Library Workshop was devoted to title II and the development of projects. A consultant was employed in American Samoa to train and work with three clerk-typists to be employed in the three community-high (school) branch libraries. The Supervisor of Libraries held the Combined Book Exhibit for islandwide meetings of elementary and secondary school teachers. She also worked with Samoan teachers participating in the training sessions being held for them by the University of Hawaii during the summer.

The Coordinator of Hawaii's ESEA title II program met with school librarians, district librarians/audiovisual liaison personnel, and school audiovisual coordinators in eight meetings on five islands during the year. She also held a workshop for school librarians and teachers in the evaluation of nonbook media for reading, and participated in the annual orientation of librarians new to Hawaii.

California engaged in a number of staff development activities during the year. Four sessions were conducted in the San Francisco Bay area for about 600 participants, including administrators, librarians, and teachers; and 15 other workshops were held in other areas of the State. A workshop in Los Angeles was arranged solely for private school personnel. Such sessions are necessitated by the rapid turnover of administrators and media personnel in the private schools where children and teachers are being served by the title II program. A workshop for 150 persons in Sacramento was devoted entirely to Phase II projects. The employment of media specialists throughout the State as consultants for inservice training to local school districts was an important facet of the title II program and provided strong supplement to the basic State staff.

In the State of Washington, the subject area and media supervisors work as a team through inservice, change-process models, district consultation, and school visitations to assist the field in effective selection, organization, and utilization of all learning resources. As in previous years, each district carried out an extensive self-evaluation preliminary to school district curriculum surveys conducted by the State. The learning resources staff used this information during on-site visits as a basis for making recommendations for program improvements on the selection, organization, and use of materials purchased under title II.

The Oregon Board of Education coordinated a school-public library cooperative symposium intended to further the concept of cooperation and which included discussions to increase usage of materials, resources, and personnel.

Increased Employment of School Media Personnel

A number of States report significant changes in the number of media specialists, technicians and aides who were employed during fiscal year 1971 as a result of Federal programs of financial assistance to local school media programs. Media staff are often employed using funds from such Federal programs as ESEA titles I and III; however, additional staff are also employed using State and local funds. The employment of such personnel has frequently been stimulated by the acquisition of materials under ESEA title II, since there is need for media personnel to select, organize, and administer materials and consult with children and teachers on their use.

The number of new media personnel employed in fiscal year 1971 has declined from that of previous years because of the tight fiscal situation that exists in many school districts; however, the scope of improvement in the number of media personnel employed as a result of Federal programs is shown in the following examples:

- In Pennsylvania, approximately 50 additional specialists, technicians, and aides were employed.
- During the past decade, a comparative analysis of three major surveys of school libraries made in Delaware shows that there were almost three times as many librarians and eight times as many media aides in 1970 than in 1960. There was an average of 903 students to one librarian, which is still unsatisfactory. The most satisfactory evidence of growth is that only a tenth of one percent of the student population is without access to an organized library collection.
- Connecticut reports a greater gain in certificated school library personnel in fiscal year 1971 than in any previous year. Four new positions as system-wide media coordinators and 47 school media specialists were established, with 29 of the latter established as full-time positions in elementary schools.
- Professional media staff in Massachusetts increased from 492 to 876 in a 4-year period, an average yearly gain of 96. Local education agencies reported that 188 media specialists were employed directly as a result of ESEA title II funds.

Alabama reports an increase in the number of school media personnel, with a few systems employing a media specialist for each elementary school. A significant change in the role of the media specialist has come about because of the emphasis on the Right to Read program, with many of them assuming a coordinating role for the school reading program. In Georgia, 82 percent of all schools had at least one full-time media specialist as opposed to 73 percent in fiscal year 1970. Many of the larger schools, both elementary and secondary, added a second or third media specialist. Two or more smaller schools sometimes share the services of a media specialist. There were full-time media aides in 348 schools in fiscal year 1971, whereas only 165 schools had media aides in fiscal year 1970.

Maryland reports a significant improvement in media programs throughout the State because of the hiring of aides. In Puerto Rico, 144 media specialists and technicians and 108 librarians were employed during fiscal year 1971 as a result of Federal programs of financial assistance to local schools, an increase over fiscal year 1970 of 33 and 44, respectively. Due to the expansion of media collections and programs, 174 librarians and 117 aides were employed in South Carolina with salaries provided by ESEA title I. In the Virgin Islands, 19 new positions were provided under the insular budget to support school media programs. The title I program in Virginia paid the salaries of 58 librarians and 90 library aides. Alabama and Tennessee reported a decrease in the number of media aides due to establishment of new State priorities in fiscal 1971.

Despite millage failures and teacher negotiations affecting available resources for adding personnel, local school districts in several States of the Upper Midwest managed to add media personnel. Fifty-five new full or part time librarians and/or media specialists were added in Missouri, 63 in Wisconsin, and 29 in Indiana. Michigan and Ohio, however, reported a decline in the actual number of media personnel in schools, especially in elementary schools. In South Dakota, two media specialists and six media aides, trained under the Education Professions Development Act, Part B-2, were immediately employed by local schools. In 1966 there were 63 elementary school librarians in Iowa; by the end of 1970, there were 377 -- quite an increase!

Idaho reports that the impact of title II funds for instructional media materials can be credited with creating more interest in media center development. This, in turn, created a need for additional personnel. The number of media specialists, technicians, and aides in schools in Colorado who were employed during the fiscal year as a result of Federal programs of financial assistance has increased by more than 100. Most of the increase is in the category of technicians and aides employed in elementary schools. As school districts receive Federal funds in building elementary school media programs, need for personnel to administer the program arises. The development of elementary school libraries is the most apparent change resulting from title II funds.

Available data yields evidence that during fiscal year 1971, an additional 10 supervisors were employed in Texas public school districts and by private school groups. However, 117 additional school librarians were employed in local education agencies. In fiscal year 1971, the total number of supervisors and school librarians was 48 and 2,674 respectively. Federal programs of financial assistance to local school media programs have resulted in the employment of an estimated 50 media specialists, technicians, and aides in Oklahoma. Aides are used in many title I schools under the supervision of a librarian.

No accurate count is available on the number of volunteers who are assisting in school library programs, but on-site visits indicate increasing numbers.

According to the title II applications for the fiscal year ending June 1971, the following full-time equivalents personnel were employed in the State of Washington as a result of Federal programs of assistance to local school media programs:

12	supervisors
10	learning resources specialists
3	technicians
36	clerks and aides

Mesa Community College has developed a 2-year library technician program, but it is still too early to tell how successfully graduates from the program will be integrated into the staffing of the school libraries of Arizona.

During the year, library clerical staff on Guam increased by four in secondary schools and by eight central office positions; certificated librarians and audiovisual staff increased proportionally. In Bureau of Indian Affairs schools, about a dozen media positions were added, mostly aides.

Selection of Materials

From the beginning of the title II program, State department of education personnel have given very careful attention to the selection of materials for purchase. Their efforts have generally ensured that the materials have been of high quality and relevant to the needs of the pupils and teachers who use them.

Comment on the selection materials is excerpted from the Northeast States' reports for fiscal year 1971:

> New Jersey: Greatest change in selection of materials occurred for the use of children and teachers in private schools. The first year's selections often reflected the most persuasive salesman or a request for textbooks. In the last few years the degree of sophistication in public schools is remarkable. Older and more well developed collections for public school participants indicate that title II funds are being used for building special collections in special subject areas.
>
> New Hampshire: Each packet of title II materials contains a list of selection sources. Each purchase list for materials is scanned, before approval in the title II office. If any items seem inappropriate or ineligible, an inquiry is made by telephone or letter, and suggestions given for suitable substitutes; no project is approved until such matters have been resolved. For purchases made from title II or local funds, quality materials are emphasized. Bibliographies collected from professional journals, newsletters from other States, and lists compiled by consultants in our Department have proved useful in meeting requests from librarians and teachers.
>
> Delaware: In order to assure a high quality collection of materials, the State has provided library selection tools from ESEA title II administrative funds to every school. Acceptable selection tool must be used for selecting materials, especially in those schools without the services of professional librarians.
>
> Connecticut: To assure the purchase of quality materials, school districts continue to (1) increase the number of employed certificated school librarians, (2) encourage professional personnel to attend library and other educational meetings where books and other materials are exhibited, and (3) purchase a wide range of selection guides.
>
> New York: The following activities are evidence of the contribution of the ESEA title II program in New York State to the selection of materials of high quality:
>
> a. Distribution of bibliographies of selection tools
>
> b. Preparatory activities for circulating examination collections on drugs and environmental education

c. District selection policy requirement for competitive grants

d. Selection based on greater concern for individual needs and independent study

Selection of material is an area of prime concern to all of the States in the Southeast. Kentucky's State Plan for title II requires that State standards for selection of material be closely followed. This mandate has from the beginning resulted in purchase of high quality materials. The District of Columbia Plan specifies that only materials "of high quality" be supplied to children and teachers with ESEA title II funds, thereby screening unsuitable and irrelevant material. In Georgia, the supplementary amounts of funds made available by ESEA title II has enabled media specialists to place greater emphasis on quality materials. Many Mississippi schools have reached national quantitative standards for book collections; emphasis in selection has centered on readability, with high-interest, low-vocabulary materials predominating. The emphasis placed by title II staff in Alabama on the use of selection aids has increased awareness of the quality of materials, resulting in better selection practices. A local education agency in Maryland used title II funds to purchase materials for the use of curriculum development committees. Committee members participate in selection, which contributed greatly to the acquisition of quality materials. Tennessee and West Virginia specify the use of selection aids and identified needs as guidelines for purchase. Virginia is currently emphasizing quality selection. The provision of a State supervisor with title II funds has increased the amount of field time to assist local agencies with selection and provided professional materials to assist in the performance of this duty. An extensive bibliography of selection tools was distributed to all librarians in the State with title II funds. Each school unit has been requested to develop a policy for selection of materials and obtain school board approval for it. In divisions in the State without the services of a media supervisor, over 250 individual schools were visited during the year to assist in selection and use of materials. A staff worked with groups at two State-sponsored conferences on selection and use of materials for drug education. At two of the four State regional meetings, staff members presented multi-media programs for workshop groups on selection; exhibits of materials were available for examination.

Each State of the Upper Midwest has set forth criteria for selecting quality materials, but no State or region produces any selection lists. Local school districts are encouraged to purchase instructional materials listed in standard sources and to preview before purchase, if feasible. Many of the intermediate units have provided examination collections of school library resources and textbooks. In Iowa, each of the State regional centers has a selection committee, composed of teachers, librarians, administrators, and media center professional personnel. Released time from school is granted local school staff to serve on selection committees. Minnesota continues to check the purchase lists submitted by local education agencies without professional media personnel.

Oklahoma reports that the title II office in the State Department of Education has insisted that 8 percent of materials purchased with title II funds be chosen from recognized selection tools. In New Mexico, a committee for the development of procedures and materials for bilingual education was partially funded through title II. A consultant with extensive experience was employed to evaluate Spanish language materials purchased by one large district. A list of these materials with notations indicating grade level, difficulty, and quality will be sent all public and private schools.

As a result of having additional funds for the purchase of instructional materials, media specialists in Wyoming increasingly involve teachers and students in the selection process. This greatly increases the probability of purchasing materials applicable to the school's program and the student interests and abilities. In Texas, title II program staff work closely with subject consultants to assist local education agencies to strengthen curricular offerings through title II acquisitions. State subject consultants and librarians assist local education agency personnel in identifying and selecting appropriate materials to meet specific needs and to enrich particular areas. Title II staff seek to anticipate local education agency requests for assistance in selecting materials to implement new State priorities, curricular programs, or popular special interest areas. Sources of materials are prepared and distributed to interested librarians and administrators. Emphasis has been placed on the use of appropriate selection tools as staff members conduct workshops, in-service sessions, or make consultative visits. As basic book collections improve, increasing stress is given to the use of evaluative instruments in selection of nonbook materials. This phase of library media service is particularly significant as materials are chosen for migrant schools or schools with bilingual programs. In addition, attention is focused on the school's materials collection by monitoring teams and accreditation teams as they work with the local district toward improving the educational program.

The administrative funds from title II have enabled local media personnel to receive lists of selection aids, periodic suggestions for purchase, and a resource for more expensive indexes to materials, which are sometimes necessary to locate and/or identify particular materials. At Sargent School, Colo., the title II program contributed to the individualization of instruction this year by providing the materials needed. Also, more audiovisual materials were provided for the individual use of those having reading difficulty. An increased desire to learn resulted from this effort.

The title II staff also worked with the Improved Learning Unit of the Colorado Department of Education in the preparation and distribution of bibliographies for use in environmental education.

The Oregon title II administrator and consultants have contributed to selection of high quality materials by emphasizing schoolwide involvement in the selection procedure, basing selection upon the schools' curriculums, using standard selection aids, and suggesting long-range acquisition plans. In all on-site visits in the State, emphasis is placed on State and local objectives. State subject specialists accentuate the use of materials bought with title II funds and provide wide coverage of curriculum areas.

The Small Schools Sharing Program in Washington State, which encourages individualized instruction in the classroom, has helped in selection of materials of high quality which are appropriate for the children and teachers who use them in the six districts involved in the program, as well as many other school districts throughout the State. The materials included in the packages were based on learning activity packages developed in the West Valley School District. School district subject area specialists held workshops in language arts and drug education to help districts select materials, and the 1970 Books for School Libraries, an annual publication which annotates over 1,200 new books, K-12, was mailed to each district by the State department of education.

In Arizona, the title II administrator gave personal assistance to small schools without librarians in choosing materials, and in some cases made the actual selections by request.

Coordination With Other Federal Programs

The ESEA title II program was coordinated in fiscal year 1971 with other titles of ESEA, as well as a number of other programs of Federal financial assistance, in order to achieve maximum educational benefits. As in previous years, the most extensive coordination involved programs funded under NDEA title III and ESEA title I.

Coordination of NDEA title III and ESEA title II was reported by both State and local staff. Media and subject specialists employed in State departments of education with NDEA title III funds frequently gave consultative assistance in the selection and organization of materials and provided the equipment acquired under NDEA title III for the use of media obtained through title II.

New media centers in elementary schools serving disadvantaged children have been established using funds under ESEA titles I and II. Title I funds are used to obtain media facilities, professional and clerical media personnel, and media center equipment and supplies, which are not eligible under ESEA title II. Title II funds are utilized to buy such library materials as books and audiovisual materials. Materials are also purchased under the ESEA title I program.

The combined administration of the ESEA title II and NDEA title III in New York is the most successful example of coordination of Federal programs. A new program option -- the unigrant -- was developed which permitted local education agencies to plan a comprehensive project of educational improvement, drawing on both ESEA title II and NDEA title III funds. Only one application form was required and more districts interested in the competitive phase of the program elected to submit unigrant applications.

Delaware reported formation of a committee within the State Department of Education to assist in Federal program coordination. Although the committee is too new to have effected any dynamic changes as yet, planning for coordination is now underway. Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Vermont, and Rhode Island reported the traditional kinds of Federal program coordination such as:

- Provision under title II of media to support innovative and exemplary programs funded under ESEA title III.
- Cooperative planning between Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) advisory committees and title II advisory committees.
- Provision under ESEA title V of professional books and journals.
- Employment of library aides under ESEA title I and Office of Economic Opportunity Program.

Cooperative planning with directors of other Federal programs was reported by Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, Puerto Rico, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Alabama, and the Virgin Islands. The Bureau of State and Federal Relations in Kentucky held regular staff meetings to emphasize such coordination. In Maryland, the LSCA and ESEA title II staff members cooperatively held an Exceptional Children Workshop. The LSCA Specialist in Community Services has shared responsibility with ESEA title II in working in local agencies in the area of reading for the disadvantaged.

Puerto Rico, because of the centralized nature of the system, finds coordination easy to effect. Examples of this coordination are: an ESEA title I project on the use of Educational Technology in Instructional Development received materials from ESEA title II funds; materials acquired with ESEA title II funds were loaned to schools developing ESEA title VII bilingual programs.

In Alabama there are a number of Right to Read projects which are funded cooperatively with ESEA title I and title VI of the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP). ESEA title I purchased bookmobiles which were staffed with LSCA personnel and equipped with materials purchased by ESEA titles I and II. One county in Virginia used ESAP funds to help establish central libraries in 11 target schools and employed a library supervisor. Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) funds provided a training program for aides. Portable units created quarters. In another county a media bus bought through ESEA title I and equipped with materials furnished through ESEA title II is used in a migrant education program. All States reported continued close cooperation at both State and local levels with the NDEA title III program.

Coordination of ESEA title II with other programs of Federal financial assistance in the Upper Midwest States was effected through formal and informal arrangements. The Illinois Educational Service Regions pooled collections and services provided by ESEA titles I, II, III, V, and NDEA III. Michigan and South Dakota reported local schools using ESEA title II and NDEA title III as a "package unit" -- software from ESEA title II and hardware from NDEA title III. A close and cooperative relationship with LSCA exists in Missouri, as in most other States. Nebraska and North Dakota cited the small number of State professional staff as a contributing factor to the coordination of State and Federal programs. The Area VI ESEA title II Center in Iowa received an ESEA III grant to develop a network of print and nonprint professional materials; each of the other centers are administering portions of the Highway Safety Act of 1966 with a $200,000 allocation, Vocational Education Amendment of 1968 with a $150,000 allotment, and a Special Education allotment of $80,000.

The Idaho staff responsible for administering the various programs of Federal financial assistance work very closely together. Physical location of offices makes this kind of relationship easy. Each of these persons is constantly reminding local educational agencies of the possibility of strengthening one program by utilization of another. The subject area consultants within the department advise teachers of the availability of materials through title II, and the supporting equipment available under title III NDEA. When the special purpose grants were made under title II, and the amount requested far surpassed the amount available, several projects were funded jointly with title I in districts eligible for title I programs.

In Montana, schools continue to coordinate title II with other Federal programs; however, a special effort was made during fiscal year 1971 to increase coordination of projects implementing the media center concept.

Title II efforts in New Mexico were coordinated with other Federal programs through the purchase of books and materials to support the instructional program. This was particularly evident when programs initiated under title IV of the Civil Rights Act used staff provided under ESEA title I, software provided by title II, and equipment acquired under NDEA title III.

In the spring of 1971 in Utah, the NDEA title III program and State Media funds were integrated with title II to allow districts to focus monies on specific instructional needs. State curriculum personnel, as well as media specialists, met with district administrators, supervisors and media representatives to plan for effective utilization of these funds. Throughout the academic year, State media and curriculum staff and some district media leaders visited local media facilities on a consultative basis. After on-site visits, State media supervisors were invited by the media administrator to discuss progress and concerns in project development and relating project plans to State and local objectives.

In Alaska, several local educational agencies have used title II funds for materials to supplement ESEA title I reading programs. In addition, a new consolidated application for ESEA title II basic and special-purpose grants and NDEA title III was developed to encourage districts to coordinate funding.

In Oregon, the close coordination of ESEA title II and NDEA title III is reflected in local project applications. Title II supplied considerable amounts of materials for reading projects funded under title I, and for programs for handicapped children under ESEA title VI. Title II also helped support a trilingual ESEA title VII project. The State Library/Media Specialist serves as a title II consultant and also serves on the State Committee for Interlibrary Cooperation and LSCA and has been active in coordinating activities that come before these groups.

Title II was the funding source for most of the materials for the Hawaii English Project funded under ESEA title III. An after school reading guidance program in one school extends the school effort to stimulate intellectual endeavors in the home. ESEA title I supplied the personnel and title II provided the materials. A remedial reading program funded by ESEA title I will use materials supplied by title II to teach culturally disadvantaged children from various ethnic backgrounds--part Hawaiian, Filipino, Portuguese, and Japanese. A primary grade program funded by ESEA title I for equipment used title II funds for materials to develop an individualized program of instruction in language arts and other curriculum areas.

Many of the curriculum specialists in the Washington State agency have responsibilities as team leaders of other Federal programs. These specialists evaluated and recommended title II proposals in their respective areas; thus, coordination of State and Federal programs could be planned and monitored more effectively. The 287 fiscal year 1971 title II applications revealed extensive coordination with the following other Federal programs:

ESEA title I	124 districts - personnel
	73 districts - equipment
	89 districts - materials
ESEA title I (Migrant)	16 districts - personnel
	18 districts - equipment
	22 districts - materials
ESEA title III	6 districts - personnel
	11 districts - equipment
	21 districts - materials
NDEA title III	120 districts - equipment
	83 districts - materials

The Arizona State title II coordinator is on the NDEA title III Advisory Board. Individual school projects often use various Federal programs as funding sources, with title II supplying additional materials. In a large number of Arizona school districts, ESEA title I funds are used to employ school library aides and clerks. These schools were thus able to offer library services during lunch periods, after school, and during the summer months. Summer reading programs which used materials bought by title II are common in schools in these districts. Special stress has been placed in the State on reading projects so that there are numerous ones in which title II funds supplied materials to help support and supplement ESEA title I programs. Examples are bilingual projects in Scottsdale and Chandler Elementary School Districts. NDEA title III has frequently been used to obtain audiovisual equipment with which materials acquired with title II are used. An interesting example of coordination of the two programs in Arizona can be found in Buckeye Union High School where NDEA title III was used to pay for an Apollo Model Planitarium housed in the new science wing of the school and title II supplied the programed materials used with it.

The Supervisor of Libraries in American Samoa assisted in other Federal programs by providing advisory services in book selection and the use of selection aids. All materials were processed centrally by the Processing Center. Remodeled quarters in high school buildings serve as joint community-school libraries, which are stocked with materials purchased with LSCA title I, ESEA title II, and State funds.

In the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, LSCA bookmobile programs continue to carry materials acquired with ESEA title II funds, and an LSCA-sponsored workshop for library personnel stressed selection, acquisitions, and library use of materials obtained from all funding sources. In Arizona, two high schools have been designated as reference centers for the Navapache Interlibrary Communications Project funded by LSCA title III to service the entire communities of Navajo and Apache Counties. Special title II grants strengthened the reference collections in the two schools.

Improving Accessibility of Materials

State school media supervisors have made considerable effort in their work with the title II program to encourage administration and scheduling policies that make school library resources easily accessible to pupils and teachers and that provide for optimum use of materials.

New York reports:

> Efforts to encourage administrative and scheduling practices that permit free and easy use of materials of all kinds are most evident in the number of grant recipients reporting partial or total flexible scheduling on the elementary level. On both the elementary and secondary level there is a significant increase in libraries open for service before and after the regular school day. Media centers are open at all times of the school day, before and after school, evenings, Saturdays, and vacations.

Rhode Island:

> Frequent dialog occurs between top administrative personnel and our office concerning flexible scheduling. One important factor that prevents flexible scheduling is a growing tendency of local teachers' unions to incorporate into their contract with school board the feature that all teachers be allowed a certain number of "free" periods per week. This feature, however desirable it may be, has worked negatively against school media specialists. Although school media specialists are full certificated teachers, they are not included among the teachers who receive "free" periods. The damaging factor however, is the administrative decision to provide the teacher's free periods by one of two methods: 1) assigning all pupils of a teacher who is scheduled for a free period to the media center; 2) using the media center as a classroom. Although media specialists are agreed that there is a need for a certain amount of instruction in the use of the facilities, the fact that the children are arbitrarily sent to the center for an ulterior purpose other than to use the center, is dangerous.

The Blueprint for New Jersey School Media Programs suggests that open scheduling and a unified service is a recommended practice. Special grants were made to 23 schools with unified programs. These schools have agreed to accept visitors after February 1, 1971. Many districts are experimenting with evening and weekend openings.

Alabama is attempting to increase the understanding of administrators of the necessity for full time professional library service in every school. Librarians and administrators are encouraged to permit children to take home all types of media along with the equipment necessary for utilization. For the past 3 years in the District of Columbia, committees of teachers, librarians, and principals have been formed to study scheduling practices in school media centers and make recommendations for open scheduling to the Superintendent of Schools. In Puerto Rico, a list of textbooks acquired with ESEA title II monies was published and circulated to facilitate the interchange of books among the school districts and among private schools. In the Virgin Islands, school administrators are encouraged to provide released time for teachers to visit the ESEA title II centers. Also, provision has been made for free delivery of materials to and from both public and private schools.

Examples from several reports of the Upper Midwestern States illustrate the efforts made to improve accessibility:

> South Dakota schools have been encouraged to use the library or resource center as an extension of the classroom. ...Many media centers were open before and after school, and during the lunch hour in addition to the school day.
>
> "Integrated Shelving for Maximum Accessibility", a $24,000 special project in a Wisconsin elementary school, demonstrated that integrated shelving of print and audiovisual materials tripled the viewing and listening experiences of pupils over the previous year. Since 1970 the State education agency has strongly discouraged scheduling classes to library media centers and recommended free access. The second half of the 1971 summer institute was used to explore alternatives for "unscheduling school libraries and integrating the teaching of library skills with classroom-related activities."
>
> Improved delivery and late afternoon and night service have made materials and center personnel more accessible in Iowa. Since most inservice meetings are held at the media centers, teachers and administrators come early and stay late to select materials for classrooms. Several centers have encouraged students to borrow materials directly.

The Wyoming Media Consultant has been involved in the writing and implementing of the school evaluation program conducted by the State Department of Education. Tight scheduling, exorbitant fines, and extensive restrictions for use of media centers are discouraged by evaluation teams; an attempt is being made to eliminate visits to the media center by schedule only, drop fines for overdue materials and encourage circulation and use of materials of all types.

In Montana and Idaho, during all media workshop sessions, special emphasis was placed on different practices that permit free and easy use of materials of all kinds. For example, media supervisors encouraged librarians to liberalize lending policies to allow students to take home all kinds of materials, including reference books, audiovisual materials, and equipment. It was also suggested that for certain kinds of material (e.g., paperback books) students should not be required to go through formal checkout procedures. This "free circulation" encourages students to use library resources. The media supervisors also suggested that school libraries be opened to students at nights and on weekends.

Texas reports that title II staff work closely with members of the Division of Program Development and the Office of Planning and the Education Service Center media personnel to enlist cooperative efforts for educational improvement which includes the encouragement of administrative and scheduling practices that permit free and easy use of materials of all kinds. Accreditation teams and Southern Association Evaluation teams emphasize effective use of materials in meeting student needs and individualizing instruction. Model media programs have been identified and are employed as demonstration schools where administrators and librarians may observe desirable administrative and scheduling practices and procedures. A number of open schools have received wide-spread publicity which noted the students' free access to materials at all times of the school day. Other schools have experimented with extended hours and an extended year and included free access to materials as an added feature.

Public school districts that have private schools within their geographic boundaries must establish a committee representative of all administrative units to develop a plan for making materials available to all students and teachers. Such planning has resulted in novel approaches to meeting the relative needs of all students and teachers.

In order to receive maximum usage of expensive or specialized materials, lists have been prepared by districts for circulation to all schools within the district. Lists of specialized materials are prepared annually by the district for circulation to all member schools, public and non-public. The lists include such materials as: expensive audiovisual items, curriculum materials, professional collections, specialized vocational materials, braille and sight conservation books, and unique materials in content areas.

As new facilities are planned (and old facilities remodeled) in schools in the State of Washington, the supervisors of learning resources encourage flexibility of scheduling and in arrangement of the media center itself. All subject area supervisors encourage openness of program at all levels in all subject areas through publications, visitations, and conferences. The State Curriculum and Instruction staff have worked together to help teachers use the school learning resource center in a less structured way. The uncertainty of a free and unstructured learning resources program is difficult for many teachers and administrators to deal with. Schools where materials are ample and widely used produce more and better readers. Title II materials have helped to "loosen" up the use of the learning center.

The Oregon Board of Education philosophy supports administrative and scheduling practices that permit free and easy use of materials:

> The media program is, in fact, indispensable to the educational programs which develop individualization, inquiry, and independent learning for students. Current curricula emphasizing self-directed learning are generally matters of degree rather than of direction, and the media specialist must team with administrators, other staff specialists and students in providing for this individual exploration.

Directors, supervisors, and school principals in American Samoa have encouraged use of materials in schools and at home. In fact, to have and to be allowed to use materials free is a real innovation in the territory, and an exciting one for the children.

Development and Revision of Standards

In fiscal year 1971, many States continued to develop or revise standards for school library resources. The main purpose of standards in the title II program is to establish qualitative and quantitative measures which will set new or revised requirements for the materials that are obtained. The general direction taken in new or revised standards is toward the inclusion of requirements for equipment and materials needed to meet the multi-media approach to good teaching and effective learning. Efforts to improve standards are illustrated by the following examples:

- Minimum standards for elementary school libraries in Vermont were revised in 1969. Revision of the 1964 standards for secondary schools is presently under consideration.

- Revision of New York standards for school libraries was begun in fiscal year 1971. Since instructional programs are in such varied stages of development, standards have been constructed in a three-phase plan to provide an instrument for long-range planning and to tailor the implementation of standards to the quality of available resources, number of independent study programs, and degree of adoption of new curriculum.

- Delaware published new school media standards in fiscal year 1971.

- In Massachusetts, the Advisory Committee on State standards for school media programs adopted the 1969 ALA - NEA Standards for School Media Programs as goals for school media centers.

West Virginia has incorporated the standards for school media programs into the new State Comprehensive Education Program. Revised standards have been developed in draft in both Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and will be presented to appropriate education groups for approval. Kentucky's revision is in process.

Most of the schools are meeting the various State standards. The number of books per child has risen in Georgia from 6.9 in 1965 with very few audiovisual materials to 9.5 books per child in 1971 with sizable collections of audiovisual media. Maryland reports 93 percent of its schools with media centers in 1971 compared to 84.2 percent in 1965; 98 percent of public school children attend schools with media centers. In South Carolina, 99 percent of the schools report central libraries. The median number of books per child in fiscal year 1964 was 4.05 compared with 12.74 in fiscal year 1971; 86.5 percent of schools have at least 10 books per child. At present 19.08 percent of the schools have 15 volumes per child. In all cases, ESEA title II has been a major factor in increasing the size of collections.

Several States in the Upper Midwest have completed revisions of State standards to reflect the 1969 Standards for School Media Programs, developed by the American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology. North Dakota's revision is included in the Administrative Manual for North Dakota Schools; Iowa published a Plan for Progress in the Media Center 7-12, a companion publication to one for grades K-6, published in 1970. This is a three-phase plan, with the third phase approximating the 1969 AASL/DAVI standards. The Wisconsin revision, Standards for School Library Media Programs, 1971-1973, combines and revises two earlier publications and expands the area of activities with an increased number of recommendations regarding the role and function of the media program in instruction. South Dakota and Missouri reported that revised school library standards became effective July 1, 1970.

In Illinois, Michigan, and Nebraska, committees composed of State, district, and local school media specialists are working on revised standards. The Minnesota State Board of Education adopted revised certification requirements for media supervisors and media generalists. Indiana and Ohio have planned no revisions.

The title II staff in Texas has contributed directly and indirectly to the capabilities of schools to meet national standards. Certainly, the acquisition program has enabled schools to move more rapidly, and some have nearly attained the recommended quantities of materials. State activities directed toward the revision and dissemination of standards were:

(1) Participation in regional meetings of the Texas Library Association, emphasizing media standards and methods for their implementation.

(2) Participation in Statewide study directed toward the revision of certification requirements for media specialists.

(3) Development of tentative State media standards and their limited distribution to city supervisors and other key educators.

(4) Recommendations and suggestions for changes in the standards which are currently under consideration and incorporation into a tentative document for field reactions and comments.

Districts employing trained librarians have used local, State, and Federal funds in the acquisition of quality materials so that many of the schools have met State standards in several aspects of the media program. Larger districts employing supervisory staff, either library, audiovisual, or dual role professionals, have operated effectively in the application of standards used for the selection of materials in assuring the acquisition of adequate materials. Very small schools were less successful in applying the criteria in the absence of trained librarians and access to selection aids. Too frequently, untrained personnel in these schools depend upon publishers' catalogs and publishers' representatives. Since 80 percent of the school children are in 150 school districts employing certified librarians, a large percentage of children and teachers have access to quality materials as a result of the successful application of the criteria for selecting materials.

In Montana revised accreditation standards for school libraries were completed and submitted to the State Board of Education on December 9, 1971, for approval. The title II program has helped supplement existing library volumes and titles so that the standards could be up-graded. However, continued Federal assistance is necessary if schools are to continue to make progress towards meeting State standards and standards recommended by the American Library Association and the National Education Association.

Until the summer of 1971, the Wyoming School Library standards of 1966 were in effect. Many of the schools have reached the levels of those standards as a direct result of title II, both in size of collection and personnel. As there are State standards for accreditation which apply to all schools, K-12 (except those belonging to North Central) and which will deal with programs as well as facilities, collection, and personnel, it was considered advisable to eliminate school library standards at the State level. Instead, the schools will be encouraged to progress according to the 1969 AASL-DAVI Standards for School Media Programs and the State accreditation criteria.

One of the satisfying accomplishments of the Instructional Media Division in Utah during FY 71 was the utilization of national media standards which served as a base for preparing State guidelines. A phasing instrument describing philosophy, program, personnel, facilities, equipment, and materials make up a document for individual schools to examine their current status, identify needs and establish long and short range goals. Two of the 40 districts in the State were introduced to the guidelines and accepted what is known as the integrated media program before the fiscal year ended. At least 10 additional districts have asked to be informed of the program in order to meet standards which would help to enrich educational offerings in each school within its district. Title II will continue to help make significant contributions in aiding administrators to upgrade standards on materials.

Standards for school media programs in Hawaii were revised and are to be reviewed soon by the State Board of Education. A committee selected from the Nevada State Advisory Council for ESEA title II prepared a draft of new standards for school libraries in the State for presentation to the State Board of Education in fiscal year 1972. A revision of Oregon's State School Media Standards was approved by representatives of Oregon's Association of School Librarians and the Oregon Instructional Media Association and officially adopted by their members on February 27, 1971. (The two organizations have since merged to form the Oregon Educational Media Association.)

The Washington State committee on standards was scheduled to meet in October 1971 to plan the year's work. Significant progress towards meeting standards has been made since 1965. The 1970-71 title II library inventory revealed an average of 11.3 books per pupil at the elementary level, an increase of 2.6 books per pupil since 1965.

The chart below shows significant increases in all types of materials during the 6 years of the title II program:

Type of Material	Number of Items in Schools 1965	1971	%Increase 1965-1971
Books	334,183	475,101	42.2
Films	4,665	25,145	53.9
Filmstrips	180,263	369,953	105.2
Tape and Disc Recordings	167,887	272,051	62.0
Slides and Transparencies	108,788	284,662	161.7
Programmed Materials	12,578	24,923	98.1
Maps, Globes, Charts and Other	101,485	121,713	19.9

The California State Board of Education adopted the California Association of School Librarians and Audio-Visual Education Association of California Standards for the Development of School Media Programs in California, 1970, for special grant demonstration libraries funded under Phase II of the title II program. School districts are becoming much more aware of the shortcomings of their library holdings, both in quantity and quality of all types of materials. Previously, lack of funds forced school districts to make do with what they had regardless of quality. Title II funds have permitted the replacement of obsolete materials with better quality titles.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has been using ALA 1960 standards as a base, but recognizes the need to develop more specific standards for BIA schools regarding such aspects as Indian collections, development of media centers, and bookmobile services.

The Supervisor of Libraries of American Samoa is at work on a long-range developmental plan for school library resource centers, in which standards will be included.

4. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE RIGHT TO READ PROGRAM

Title II's Commitment to the Right To Read -- An Introduction

Since its inception, ESEA title II has served reading programs through the provision of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for the use of public and private school children in all elementary and secondary school subjects. The formal involvement of title II with Right to Read began in 1970, when, as a consequence of President Nixon's endorsement of the Right to Read, funds for title II were restored to the budget for fiscal year 1970, and increased in both fiscal years 1971 and 1972.

An operational plan for the role of title II in the Right to Read was developed for fiscal year 1971, providing a systematic method for measuring the progress made in achieving the objective established:

> To insure that the ESEA title II Program will contribute to the Right to Read through identification and dissemination of title II supported reading projects of such creativity and breadth of application that they can be adapted by other schools; and through stimulation of activities in State departments of education designed to improve reading by use of print and other materials.

Early in fiscal year 1971, a memo on the Right to Read was sent to title II staff in State departments of education. The memorandum had four purposes:

1. To stress the importance of title II in the Right to Read.
2. To request cooperation in a plan for national dissemination of title II program contributions to the Right to Read.
3. To suggest activities which might be undertaken by State departments of education in implementing the Right to Read through title II.
4. To describe tentative plans for regional conferences on title II and the Right to Read.

Reports from title II staff in State departments of education indicate that Right to Read had high priority in fiscal year 1971 and that title II staff was engaged in a variety of Right to Read plans and activities. For example, they served on reading task forces and committees, approved and reviewed reading projects funded under title II, gave increased attention to evaluation and dissemination of the effect of title II and other Federal programs on reading, and assisted in the conduct of Statewide assessments of reading needs.

State department of education staff assigned to administer title II also participated during fiscal year 1971 in two regional conferences on title II and the Right to Read held in Washington and Denver and a national conference held in Chicago. During the regional conferences, State title II coordinators and reading and media specialists from a number of States made presentations describing selected projects representing title II implementation of the Right to Read. Slides, films, tapes, and transparencies were used in these presentations to demonstrate change and improvement in pupils' reading and learning activities, teacher response to the availability of materials, and administrative recognition of the value of materials in instruction. The response to these presentations was enthusiastic, and many States have since developed new slides, films, and tapes concerning title II projects and reading.

The national conference on title II and Right to Read was focussed on good management for program implementation, including strategies for dissemination and evaluation. Descriptions of title II reading projects serving disadvantaged children in Pontiac, Mich.; Philadelphia; American Samoa; Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and in schools conducted for Indian pupils by the Bureau of Indian Affairs provided insights into the special problems of instructional materials services for children living in urban and isolated areas. Increased understanding of thepproblems of reading and media programs resulted from visits by conference participants to 10 elementary and secondary schools in ghetto areas of Chicago. Attention was also given during the program to the reading needs of gifted pupils, and to the role of reading in vocational education, early childhood education, and instruction in the content fields.

Reports from title II administrators and reading and media specialists indicate that many of the suggestions and ideas exchanged through conferences, publications, visual presentations, and other means have been adapted for use. The reports present evidence that there is great interest and effort directed toward administering the title II program in such a way that instructional materials can make a basic difference in reading and all phases of the educational process.

Notable Reading Projects -- A Publication

One significant means of involving title II in the Right to Read Program is directed toward expanding and strengthening the services of materials to reading programs and publicizing these services and their outcomes. In order to disseminate information on title II's contribution to reading development and describe good practices that can be adopted or emulated in other schools, the Office of Education began publication in fiscal year 1971 of a series of reports describing notable reading projects funded under title II. Summaries of 121 projects have been supplied by title II coordinators and reading and media supervisors in 33 State departments of education for publication in six bulletins.

Reading projects of all types and dimensions have been reported -- early childhood education programs, reading in the content fields, relevant reading for delinquent youth, and bilingual reading programs. A number of projects have emphasized adult stimulation of reading, at home as well as at school; while others have demonstrated the function of audiovisual materials in reading.

Copies of the reports have been sent to White House staff, the Congress, State departments of education, professional organizations, and key personnel concerned with school administration and media services. It is hoped that the descriptions of the reading projects will be helpful in diffusing knowledge of innovation in reading instruction and media services and in interpreting the title II program.

Representative Creative Projects in Reading

The chief method in fiscal year 1971 of increasing title II involvement in reading was the funding of reading projects. These projects are specific plans for the improvement of reading through the acquisition of instructional materials. They range from the very small competitive grants made to individual teachers in Connecticut to quite large special-purpose grants to intermediate education units in New York.

The 100 small grants in Connecticut were used to provide reading materials for disadvantaged students. Major goals of these grants were to help pupils acquire reading skills to give them experience in the use of print and non-print media, and to determine the effect of significant quantities of high quality materials on instruction. Summaries of four Connecticut projects are given below:

Bilingual Reading Project, Waltersville Elementary School, Bridgeport

A $2,000 grant provides materials for 26 Spanish surnamed pupils (second grade) who are experiencing difficulty in reading and speaking standard English. An attractive learning environment features displays and exhibits, posters, and interesting arrangements of appealing books, filmstrips, recordings, pictures, and magazines.

Reading in The Content Fields, Florence E. Blackham Elementary School, Bridgeport

The reading consultant and two teachers have planned a reading - social studies-service program for 6th graders which features a daily opportunity to read uninterruptedly from a choice of books they can enjoy.

Parent Involvement in Reading, Uncasville Elementary School, Montville

Beyond the immediate aim of promoting the reading skill of fourth grade pupils, an additional aim of this project is to communicate to parents the meaning and objectives of the reading programs. Advice about children's books and reading is offered to interested parents by teachers and librarians.

Reading Project on Career Education, Danbury High School, Danbury

Home economics, business, industrial arts, and vocational occupations teachers introduce students to specific career opportunities. Pupil knowledge of vocations is extended through the planned integration of library resources with teaching programs.

A Georgia county that had developed a system of superior media centers through the combined use of local, State, and Federal funds was awarded for one of its schools a special-purpose grant from ESEA title II. The school has acquired materials of all types suitable for gifted pupils, giving them opportunities for independent learning through individualized assignments and advanced study. ESEA title II has helped the District of Columbia supply professional materials for projects in the field of reading. One system in Mississippi reports that ESEA title II has been extremely helpful in providing materials for the open concept and team teaching approach for individualized instruction. Maryland has a school with a Reading to a Friend Program. This program involves kindergarten-age youngsters and older children who want to read to a kindergarten child. Its goals include the development of good listening habits, interest in creative writing, improving oral reading, and working well with other children. The program has been enthusiastically received.

As part of Ohio's Commitment to the Right to Read goal, nine school districts received title II special-purpose grants ranging from $30,000 to $80,000 and totaling over a half million dollars. The grants will enable the districts to purchase additional instructional materials to provide support for teaching reading at the junior and senior high level. They will also aid in establishing model collections of multi-media materials in overall communication skills.

The Missouri State Board of Education authorized the State Department of Education to set aside 10 percent of the ESEA title II allotment for special needs projects. The Developmental Reading Project in Springfield, Mo., provided classes in reading instruction for 1,763 seventh-grade students. With the cooperation of the University of Missouri, a curriculum committee developed the program, which provides individualized or prescriptive instruction for students and an in-service course on reading instruction for teachers.

The Highland Park School District in Michigan describes a sixth-grade reading project as follows:

> In our school district, a wide range of reading levels begin to appear in the sixth grade. Materials to meet this range are not always available in the classrooms. Several teachers this year used library books instead of reading texts as a basis for their reading program; many of the audiovisual materials in the resource center were also used. Many meetings were held between resource center personnel and reading consultants in an effort to combine their efforts in working with students on the reading curriculum. Current plans are to locate reading and resource services in the same area with reading consultants assisting teachers in using increasing amounts of resource center materials in their reading programs.

In Idaho Springs, Idaho, an exciting building houses a learning environment and an educational program designed to interest and educate the individual student. For example, garden tools and packets of garden seeds for sale are used in conjunction with books on agriculture and ecology found on adjacent shelves in the media center.

In Larimer County, Colo., title II money was used to purchase bilingual materials, and materials on ecology, drugs, and the humanities, which are especially needed in the curriculum of the school. Schools in Mesa County Valley have made excellent use of library resources acquired under title II in improving instructional programs for educationally and economically disadvantaged children. In Emerson Elementary School, which is a title I ESEA project, a concentration of effort, services, and materials has provided a learning environment which has already resulted in an improved attitude on the part of the children toward school. Testing appears to support the belief that Project: Educational Improvement is successful. In Denver, such schools as Cheltenham School, Garden Place Elementary, and Cole Junior High School show evidence of the impact of school library resources acquired under title II (as well as other special funding) in improving instructional programs for educationally and economically disadvantaged children.

New Mexico reserves approximately 25 percent of acquisition funds for special projects supporting reading or bilingual education. Idaho reports that creative projects, for the development of curricular and instructional techniques made possible through title II, have included development of the inquiry method in all disciplines, experience-based curriculum, utilization of multimedia as motivation in social studies reading, skill development in reading, individualized reading in the regular classroom for children with learning disabilities, and utilization of reference materials to develop reading skills. Many of the programs are outstanding in planning, objectivity, and ingenuity. Of these, four projects are recommended for observation and evaluation.

Sunny Ridge Elementary School, Nampa School District No. 131

Primary grades in open classrooms surrounding library resource center. Title II funds were used for book and nonbook materials in developing clusters of centers (viewing, recording, listening, skill development, recreational reading) within the main resource center.

Harrison Elementary School, Twin Falls School District No. 411

Utilization of many titles and multiple volumes of reference materials, book and nonbook. All materials circulated to students.

The purpose is to determine impact of a flood of reference materials and to test the reliability of reference materials which are standard recommendations for elementary level students. A control school is being used as a gauge for evaluation.

McDonald Elementary School, Moscos School District No. 281

Personalized Approach Laboratory (PAL). Open complex building design. Intermediate grades. Development of seven teaching-learning centers in order to develop a greater and more lasting interest in reading.

Challis Elementary School, Challis Joint School District No. 181

Utilization of social studies curriculum as a basis for creating interest in reading. In assessing needs, the school had found it was strong in teaching basic reading, but weak in creating an interest in reading and in utilizing reading abilities.

To assist school districts in implementing activities that build upon unique racial and cultural patterns and attitudes, the Texas Education Agency has developed and identified curriculums available to districts. Each school must identify needs of minority group children and expand or modify offerings to more adequately meet these needs by incorporating into the educational framework appropriate programs, materials, and curriculums. Frequent request for assistance in identifying materials and sources of materials to support alternate programs are received in the title II office. Responses to these requests include lists of sources of materials which are eligible acquisitions under the title II program.

Title II funds were allocated to schools for use with approximately 1 million educationally deprived children, 200,000 handicapped children, and 4,500 children of migrant farm workers. Among the special projects in schools receiving these funds are:

Corpus Christi Experiment in Reading for Mexican-American Children

Creedmore Bilingual School

Cypress-Fairbanks Demonstration Center for Individualized Instruction

San Antonio Bilingual Demonstration and Dissemination Center

El Paso Language Training and Instruction Center

Aldine Model Education Demonstration Center for Mentally and Physically Handicapped Children

Bay City Exemplary Services for Atypical Children

Examples of creative projects in reading in Utah include the Leo J. Muir School, Bountiful, where the media coordinator has, for 3 years, developed a multimedia approach to stimulate reading for all children and Orem Junior High School, Orem, where an individualized reading program was established to provide underachievers with a success oriented reading experience. The project was an effort to provide parents with more specific advice on their children's reading and encourage them to help children learn to read, write, and spell. The impact of school library resources in improving programs for educationally and economically disadvantaged children with reading deficiencies came not only from monies through title II, but additional fiscal aid was used from title II, NDEA title III, and other Federal and local funds. School districts of Provo, Carbon, Davis, Logan, Box Elder, and Uintah also operated special reading programs.

Indian Oasis School District, Sells, Ariz., has an on-going "Carry-Home Oral Language Improvement Program" for its bilingual children. The program goals are to develop in the Papago children, K-3, oral language facility adequate to assure success in the language arts, speaking, reading, and writing, and ultimately, school achievement; as well as to develop in the children experiential background associated with skills in communication. Children have ready access to language arts enrichment materials on a take-home basis, along with the necessary equipment for viewing and listening. Since many of the homes have no electricity, battery operated equipment was purchased with NDEA title III funds. All materials are taken home in sturdy cases with attachments for holding filmstrips and books. Twenty-eight teachers were enrolled in a Reading Seminar at Arizona State University which prepared teachers for optimum use of the materials. A program of formal testing in reading was initiated as a means of establishing baseline data against which progress in succeeding years can be measured. A random sample cross section of the primary grades for oral language facility assessment is also planned.

A nongraded reading program for grades 4, 5, and 6 is being planned in a private school in Hawaii, using materials acquired under title II for individualized learning. Third graders who received remedial reading assistance under title I will be involved. A pretest, evaluation and diagnosis of needs, study of essential areas in English, spelling, and comprehension, and a final test with reevaluations will be made to determine the success of this program.

The State of Washington has funded 12 reading projects under ESEA title II at a total cost for materials of $115,400, seven under the Small School Sharing Program. Three examples are cited below:

> Reading Enjoyment and Development (READ), Pullman to improve learning experiences and increase interest in reading for the students at Lincoln Middle School (grades 6-8) through building a wide range of learning resources and developing creative uses of these materials by all classroom teachers cooperating with the librarian, reading specialist, counselor, and school administration.
>
> Color Them Read, West Valley
>
> "Color Them Read" has four major areas of emphasis for grades 7-12: it focuses on teaching reading in content areas: it encourages cross-disciplinary planning; it stimulates staff interaction and planning; and it fosters individualization by a multimedia approach to learning. In addition, the language arts portion will cooperate with several smaller districts to diffuse the existing language arts program (Small School Sharing Project).
>
> Children's Literature for High School, Bellevue
>
> The project will provide materials for an elective course in children's literature for high school students, which will be taught cooperatively by high school English teachers and elementary librarians with outstanding competencies in children's literature.

Until recently, children in American Samoa had been taught exclusively through classroom television in a structured English class without books. Their English language competencies are now at a level where books and reading can take on a new meaning. Books for purchase under title II were carefully selected to fit into the language curriculum and are housed in the schools for easy access. Even the early childhood teachers are making use of picture and story books in their work with young children in the villages.

Interpretation of The Right to Read

Reports from title II staff in State departments of education indicate that they are giving priority to the interpretation of the Right to Read Program to the educational community and general public. The increase from an $80 million dollar appropriation in 1972 to $90 million for 1972 has underlined the importance of expanding and strengthening the services of media to reading programs and publicizing these services and their outcomes.

Title II staff in the Connecticut State Department of Education has been especially successful in the use of educational television to disseminate information on title II. Connecticut Public Television, Inc., provided free time in fiscal year 1971 for the telecasting of a special program in which State consultants explained the relationship between title II and the Right to Read Program.

Other activity concerned with the dissemination of information on the Right to Read includes:

- Rhode Island publishes an exceptionally informative bulletin, Media News, for the use of local school personnel. Each issue in fiscal year 1971 devoted considerable space to explanations of title II and the Right to Read.
- In Massachusetts, the title II staff has attempted to aline its program with the Right to Read effort as broadly as possible. Space was accorded the national effort in a bimonthly newsletter, and the Right to Read was mentioned specifically in application material for special-purpose grants.
- The Right to Read Program was described by the Vermont title II administrator whenever the opportunity presented itself: in bulletins from the State agency office, in talks at schools, before PTA groups, and at meetings of principals, teachers, librarians, and superintendents.

Kentucky held four regional ESEA title II Right to Read Conferences in fiscal year 1971 to explain and promote the relationship of the two programs. Also, the Office of Research, Planning, and Evaluation published a booklet on the Right to Read Program, including its involvement with other Federal programs. In South Carolina, the Right to Read is incorporated into the major "Basic Skills Improvement" objective of the State Department of Education. The Office of Public Information, in connection with the Office of Planning, has cooperated in a program of publications, press releases, and brochures. Tennessee has publicized the relationship of the Right to Read to the ESEA title II Program in staff meetings in the State Department of Education, as well as at the annual Superintendents' Study Council meeting. The majority of Michigan school districts managed to get information about ESEA title II and the Right to Read in small town newspapers or school papers, and to discuss the relationship in faculty meetings. The Wisconsin State Right to Read Committee organized a State meeting for all media and reading personnel at which Dr. Ruth Love Holloway was the featured speaker.

The Texas reading consultant and a title II staff member prepared a slide presentation in which the goals of the Right to Read Effort were described in conjunction with the role of the library in supporting the goal of each. Examples of local education agency programs to achieve each goal were expanded by the library's role in the various programs. As a result, the major features of various programs were disseminated to public, school, and college librarians, to parent-teacher groups, to interested lay groups, and to administrators. The acquisition of materials under the title II program was noted in the libraries' role in the various programs.

The reading consultant and a title II staff member in the Texas Education Agency have worked as a team to present the Right to Read Effort to interested groups. Both were active members of the Task Force which developed the document establishing the Texas goals and both are members of the Continuing Committee on the Texas Right to Read Effort as well as the Steering Committee for the larger Continuing Committee.

Throughout the State of Washington meetings have been conducted using the National Book Committee filmstrip presentation on the Right to Read. International Reading Association groups have conducted meetings and discussed the 10 imperatives set forth in the presentation. Title II applications listed several areas of concern from which districts selected one or several priority concerns. "Right to Read" programs were listed first in order to emphasize the importance of this effort. Subsequently, 79 districts listed Right to Read as the first Priority at the elementary level and 31 districts at the secondary level.

The priority on reading in Oregon has required every school district to submit a planning statement on reading to the State Board of Education.

Every school district has studied its reading program and formulated plans for local improvement. One reading specialist has contracted with the Board to review each statement and make recommendations for more effective programs. Since many title projects are integral parts of reading programs, applications are developed with considerable study and thought.

Oregon's Retrieval Dissemination Center has now been operating for 1 year, and many teachers have sought information about reading programs. Acceleration and stimulation of improved reading programs throughout the State have encouraged use of the Center. The Department publications which go periodically to school districts have carried articles about reading in general and the Right to Read effort. The Oregon Board of Education has a pre-school and primary education specialist, an intermediate grade reading specialist, and a language arts specialist who works mostly with secondary teachers. These three persons have done an outstanding job in working with reading programs throughout the State.

In planning a revision of the basic Phase I application for title II funds, the California State Advisory Committee and title II staff decided that the application form for fiscal year 1972 will require local school districts to describe how the materials will be coordinated at local levels with the Right to Read.

Title II applications in Arizona request school personnel to give high priority to Right to Read. Immediately after the application forms were sent out, a Right to Read workshop for 300 administrators, teachers, and librarians from public and private schools was sponsored by the State Department of Education and the Arizona State Library Association. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction created a Right to Read Commission, to which the title II administrator is an advisor. Two sets of filmstrips on the Right to Read are available on loan from the title II office for PTA meetings and teacher and community groups, and are being constantly requested.

5. SERVICES TO PRIVATE SCHOOL CHILDREN AND TEACHERS

State education agency personnel, local school administrators, and private school representatives have reported favorably on the relationship between public and private school representatives in connection with ESEA title II. They have been especially complimentary of the climate of cooperation created among public and private school representatives because of cooperative planning efforts.

The Massachusetts annual report contains a typical statement concerning work with private school participants:

> Private school children and teachers benefit from the ESEA title II Program to the same degree as do public school children in Massachusetts. Private schools were included in the title II 5-year evaluation, and staff members responded to telephone and written requests for information and consultation in the same manner as to requests from public schools. Some fifteen private schools were provided consultation in facilities design and materials development, while others received verbal and written help in preparing title II applications. The title II coordinator and another professional staff member visited the superintendents and staff of three of the four dioceses in Massachusetts to discuss the 5-year evaluation and future directions for the title II program in Massachusetts parochial schools. As a result of these discussions, the terms by which these dioceses were to participate in ESEA title II during FY 1972 were altered.

Title II coordinators frequently report that their service to private schools has provided them with unique knowledge of private schools and that they are frequently called upon to provide information about them that is not available elsewhere. In New Jersey, for example, the title II office has the most complete data bank on private schools in the State. Administrators of the newly funded State aid to New Jersey private schools have relied heavily on these data in implementing their program.

Services to private school children and teachers are administered from the State education agency by Alabama, the District of Columbia, Georgia, Maryland, Mississippi, and Puerto Rico. In other States, children and teachers are served by the appropriate public school agency. Virgin Islands serves public and private school children and teachers from both of its centers on an equal basis.

Services to private school representatives include on-site visits, consultative services for selection, and inservice programs. Alabama assisted in planning and developing an exemplary Right to Read project. In Puerto Rico an awardwinning training program for media administrators and personnel in selection and utilization of educational technology resources was attended by both public and private school educators. In Tennessee, because of a good working relationship with private schools established by the title II program, the resources of the State Film library have been made available to private schools.

All public and private school children in Kentucky participate in the title II program and the schools are continuing to share specially prepared lists of materials within a designated geographic or regional area. Maryland provided special inservice training to school administrators and library media personnel. Materials loaned to private school children and teachers for their use in Maryland, Mississippi, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico were fully processed and ready for use.

Even though the Nebraska private school children and teachers are not served by the local public school districts, private school media personnel participated in the Family Media Affairs, and workshops shared in mailings from the State ESEA title II office and borrowed materials from the Department of Educational Media. The Missouri ESEA title II staff processes private school reports on maintenance of fiscal effort and provides guidance in selection and utilization of materials when requested. Wisconsin and Indiana conducted seminars for private school media personnel.

In Michigan, the Intermediate School Districts administer the program for private school children and teachers, and retain title to the material. The 16 area centers in Iowa perform this service, and the Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction is the legal agent for participating private school children and teachers.

In Texas, local education agencies having private schools within their geographic boundaries are mandated under the title II program to form local committees representative of the administration of all schools with eligible students. The purpose of the committee is to determine the relative need of pupils and teachers for instructional materials, make recommendations on the types and kinds of materials, and develop an equitable plan for making all materials purchased under the local education agency project application available to all pupils and teachers in the district.

The administrative pattern for providing title II materials and services to private school children and teachers in Utah varies in districts; however, in all districts private school children and teachers have equal access to the materials. In most cases, however, students and teachers in private schools are provided materials from a central depository.

The Assistant Director of Secondary Education at the Washington State Department was appointed as the liaison person between the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the private schools. When title II problems between the private schools and the local school district cannot be resolved at the local level, he and the supervisor and learning resources served as the intermediaries. Three of the 16 members of the title II advisory committee represent private schools. Through their advice, the State agency is made aware of the concerns of private schools and thus is able to serve them more adequately. The annual bibliography of bibliographies, Selecting Learning Resources, was mailed to all private schools.

The Arizona State Education Agency lends selection aids and other professional library materials to private school personnel, and private schools are on the distribution list for newsletters. The title II administrator met with Phoenix area private school library personnel on selection of materials, and attended the annual State meeting of parochial school principals to explain the purpose of title II and administrative procedures. Representatives of private schools participated in the State's Right to Read conference.

Selection and circulation of materials to private school children and teachers under title II in Alaska is handled through the State Library. One of the 31 special grants awarded under title II in California during fiscal year 1971 was made to the Oakland Unified School District for materials to be used in a private high school in Oakland. All projects submitted under Phase II were scored competitively by field reviewers. This one proved to be outstanding among the 180 projects submitted.

6. EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION

The annual reports on title II from State departments of education include many examples of evaluation and dissemination activities. Evidence of the impact of title II on curriculum and instruction, the use of media in innovative teaching programs, development of unified media programs, use of media with special groups of children, and introduction of new types of media was obtained by State departments of education staff through both formal and subjective evaluation, on-site visits, observation, interviews, anecdotal records, case studies, and project applications and reports.

Support of Curriculum and Instruction

A. Increasing and Improving Use of Materials in Elementary and Secondary School Subjects

Subject area supervisors and curriculum specialists in State departments of education offer the opinion that title II has had a definite impact on increasing and improving the instructional resources in elementary and secondary schools subject areas. Subject supervisors and curriculum specialists are in a particularly good position to assess title II impact because they are in constant contact with classroom teachers and frequent visitors to schools. The general tone of the comments on title II impact concerns the increased instructional media made available which makes possible a broad multi-sensory approach to teaching and learning. With a greater variety of media, teachers can now determine the most appropriate combinations of media for the individual student and groups of students. The curriculum has been greatly expanded and the professional capacities of teachers greatly increased through use of media.

Two Delaware subject supervisors commented:

> Kindergarten teachers have mentioned how important instructional resources have been in their programs. Much of this material is the result of school districts utilizing ESEA title II funds. Without ESEA title II, much of the curriculum revision in social studies would not have been possible.

Examples of title II impact on increasing and improving instructional resources in other States are cited below:

- State supervisors in New York commented on the extent to which the development of new and revised curriculums based on inquiry have been dependent on increased materials. The new curriculums have developed concomitantly with the media center concept, deemphasizing textbooks and emphasizing the use of a rich collection of resources.

- New Hampshire reports that the impact of title II can be clearly seen throughout the State in the increased use of media in the curriculum, particularly those school systems actively revising their social science curriculum.

- Vermont supervisors noted that the new and attractive materials stimulated creativity in art and writing. One supervisor commented on the fact that teachers no longer had to depend on textbooks and workbooks.

The comment from the Virgin Islands on the impact of ESEA title II on increasing and improving instructional resources is echoed by many other States. "Perhaps the best evidence of the impact of ESEA title II is the fact that what was formerly innovative has now become a necessity." ESEA title II has been innovative in the Virgin Islands. The first year's budget was devoted to circulating basic book collections which stimulated participating schools to establish individually financed and maintained collections. As these became accepted and an integral part of the program, ESEA title II has gone on to more specialized materials.

The Drug Education Supervisor in Alabama observed title II impact while conducting "rap sessions" with students who relate information received from using ESEA title II materials. The curriculum specialist in Alabama bases her opinion on the increased concern and interest in individualizing instruction in all curriculum areas. Learning centers are being established to provide services that improve working skills in independent learning experiences.

The Wyoming consultant staff members of the Instructional Services Division assist the teachers in selecting and utilizing materials for use with the regular curriculum offerings as well as for use with special programs. In addition to having a consultant in the media field, the Division also provides consultant services for language arts, social studies, migrant and rural education, elementary guidance, psychology, environmental education, occupational education, including business and office education, vocational agriculture, industrial arts, home economics, health, physical education, and drug education.

In Idaho, the consultants make bibliographies of supplementary materials available to enrich the curriculum, as well as those suggested for regular programs. Each of the consultants tries to alert the teachers to good materials in any area. Title I program consultants and migrant consultant have prepared suggested lists for purchase for early childhood and migrant programs. The Idaho subject area consultants have observed, while making regular school visitations, that a greater quantity and a higher quality of materials are available for the use of students and teachers. Since the implementation of title II, the consultants report that teachers are able to secure the materials they recommend, and are constantly requesting sources of new and improved materials to utilize in the classroom. They also report that observation of student work provides evidence of a better quality of research as a direct result of having more materials available.

Texas reports that local school visitation has been the primary method of gathering information on the impact of title II funds. It is evident that foreign language teachers are using this money to purchase enrichment materials of a linguistic and cultural nature for instruction at all levels of the language program, particularly for advanced classes. These materials not only allow a wider exposure to different literary genres and to indepth information about the target culture, but they also provide students with opportunities to progress at individual rates.

The additional resources provided under title II in Hawaii have strengthened and improved the quality of the instructional program particularly in the areas of social studies, language arts, and art. Course content in these areas is being revised and the support of new instructional materials and resources is needed.

The Language Arts Supervisor in Oregon reported:

> Materials provided under title II have supported language arts programs from two standpoints. Many schools from grades 7 to 12 have moved into the elective pattern curriculum. Shorter

courses, varied in content, usually 9 to 18 weeks in length, have replaced the traditional pattern. A variety of written materials is used in these programs, and a substantial portion of the expenditures for these materials has come from title II funds. In addition many schools have established resource centers containing reading materials beyond those items used in classroom. The cost for this, also, has been provided for under title II programs.

B. Use of Materials in Innovative Teaching Programs

Several States report that title II has given special impetus to educational programs that stress individualization, inquiry, and independent learning in elementary and secondary school subjects since such teaching and learning techniques are highly dependent on large quantities of high quality instructional materials. Although the limited funds often did not provide enough materials to stimulate changes in patterns of instruction, a few States report that the special-purpose grants that provided for larger quantities of materials did make an impact on methods of teaching.

Some examples of the use of materials provided by title II in individualized instruction and independent learning are cited below:

- New Jersey reports that applications for title II funds have stated that teachers need additional materials to begin independent study programs. It is estimated that at least 10 percent of schools have used funds for this purpose.

- Although Massachusetts has little hard data to show impact of school library resources on educational programs that stress individualization and independent learning, title II staff noted that on-site visits show that the most meaningful use of materials occurs in schools where the purchase of title II materials is coordinated with learner-centered programs.

- District library/media supervisors in Delaware report that title II has been a significant contributing factor in installing programs geared to independent study. With title II, more materials representing all levels and types of ability have been provided. They also report that they are able to provide sufficient copies of popular materials for the first time.

- In New York, 28 percent of special-purpose grants, 20 percent of incentive grants, and 14 percent of unigrants were awarded to projects stressing individualization of instruction or independent study. To varying degrees, the majority of all projects incorporated elements of individualized instruction or independent study.

South Carolina reported that in the English curriculum, as an example, a primary objective of current communications programs is the utilization of special materials and audiovisual equipment which today's aurally and orally inclined student will find familiar and relevant. With continuing prolonged exposure to such daily media as television, radio, movies, and recordings, the student is best reached initially through programs emphasizing these audiovisual approaches. With remedial or slow readers who have this aural-oral background, these programs are particularly effective. In such statewide developments as "Project Success" in English, much emphases is given to this kind of approach. ESEA title II supports all of the instructional programs in the State, whether basic or experimental. In West Virginia, local education agencies which have adopted the techniques of independent learning and inquiry could not have done so without materials available by ESEA title II funds. ESEA title II in Puerto Rico has provided books and other materials for children with reading deficiencies and plans were developed to extend this service to the junior and senior high. A subject matter specialist in Alabama finds that loops, tape cassettes, and similar materials encourage the student to study independently and proceed at his own rate. Many materials of this type have been introduced into the schools by ESEA title II.

Every State of the Upper Midwest reported that the resources provided through ESEA title II were vital to the success of an individualized instructional program. The "self selection" process in an individualized program is greatly enhanced by the wide variety of materials available through ESEA title II. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction has involved more than 120 schools in an Individually Guided Education Program, multi-grade team teaching at the elementary school level. A substantial amount of ESEA II basic and special project funds has gone to these schools.

Most of the schools in Wyoming which have innovative instructional techniques are not in wealthy districts, and, as they need more materials than schools with traditional programs, are always eager to participate in title II. One in particular, with a K-6 program, provides flexible scheduling for fifth and sixth graders, and a program of individualized instruction coupled with reinforcement packets for each child, grades 1-4. Located in Torrington, Wyo., this school utilizes title II funds for the purchase of comercially prepared materials, and title III, ESEA, funds for continuous inservice education and materials production.

Much time is spent working on an individual or small group basis with all types of materials which are available to them in the media center or in departmentalized classrooms. The children in grades 1-4 are located in a separate building which has programs based on systems of individually prescribed instruction periods. In addition to published and printed materials available for independent study by large and small groups, the staff produces "reinforcement packets" for particular needs. Johnson County school district is a recent combination of several rural and small town schools. For several years, a mobile unit funded originally under ESEA title III has provided media for teacher and pupil use in the small schools. Now there is a network of media services, including production, available to all of the teachers in the county, and many new materials are purchased or created for individual purposes. In addition, consultants in nearly every area have assisted teachers in implementing individualization techniques, such as grouping, the multi-text approach, self-paced independent study and group projects.

In Louisiana, the materials provided under title II have supported the guidance program in elementary and secondary schools by making available such materials as career and vocational monographs, job inventories, job description files, charts, posters, transparencies, filmstrips, vocational interview tapes and vocational films. In addition to these materials on vocations, educational and college planning books and pamphlets have been put to use. Through independent study or with the assistance of a teacher or counselor, the student has an opportunity to become acquainted with a wide variety of vocational choices and educational opportunities and training.

There is definite evidence of increasing quantities of media, improved quality, and more creative utilization of media in Utah schools. As teachers feel more confidence in moving into new programs (organization, approaches, etc.), they and their students are using equipment and materials with greater skill and effectiveness. Individualization of instruction with increasing student use of varied media is becoming more evident in schools over the State.

Schools are acquiring commendable quantities and varieties of materials. There is a significant trend away from teacher-centered large-group use of audiovisual materials and equipment and toward individual and small group use of materials. A number of schools are becoming more flexible, to the extent that many materials are taken home and used, rather than being limited to use in a school media center. Students are stimulated to probe and research when they are not limited by the pace of a class or group.

Colorado schools have made strides this year in introducing programs that stress individualization, inquiry, and independent learning. This is much in evidence in the Cherry Creek School district where a variety of innovative learning environments exist. An outstanding example is Holly Hills Elementary School where the library is carrying out the space theme adopted by the three learning groups of about a hundred children in each, called Apollo, Gemini, and Mercury. Title II funds are used to supplement district funds in providing materials including slides, tapes, film cartridges, kits, records, and a variety of printed material.

Three special-purpose grants in Alaska supplemented the ESEA title I individualization of instruction program in elementary grades. One such program is called "Multi-Media Approach to the Study of One's Cultural and Physical Environment, Emphasizing Student-Made Materials." Title II provided software on Alaska's people and resources; equipment needed for students to prepare their own resource materials came from NDEA title III funds. Title II has aided Intermountain and Fort Wingate Schools (administered by BIA) in implementing flexible scheduling with built-in opportunities for independent study. The library center is an important part of the total resources of the school to accomplish this end.

In Arizona, more and more public elementary schools on Indian reservations are showing interest in individualizing reading instruction. Trade books are the crux of the program, although various visuals are also being used. Pony and Indian stories are not relevant for today's Indian student who demands something that more accurately mirrors his world as he sees it--something that satisfies his heightened curiosity.

The Trust Territory Department of Education created a two volume work entitled: Micronesia: A Changing Society. This program for upper secondary level social studies stresses inquiry and independent study. Social studies specialists have come to rely on ESEA title II for support of such programs through the purchase of resource materials which are vital to the program. Title II has continued to provide much of the science materials used in the inquiry approach including those stressing environmental/ecological education. Reading, as part of language programs, was supported through materials purchased under ESEA title II, although the language area is largely handled by use of other ESEA titles.

The Hawaii State Department of Education funded several programs which provide supportive materials for title I projects stressing individualization of instruction. A primary grade program funded by title I for equipment will use title II funds for materials to develop an individualized program of instruction in language arts and other curriculum areas. An independent learning resource center for disadvantaged children, grades 9-12, has equipment, facilities, and personnel funded by title I for use in English and social studies. Title II materials are used to supplement what the school has been able to furnish.

The major emphasis in an individualized reading program in Lincoln Park Elementary School, Portland, Oreg., is the pupil's selection of his own reading material. To this end, a rich and worthwhile collection of books, magazines, newspapers, pamphlets, paperbacks, reading laboratories, programed instructional materials, controlled reader filmstrips, recordings, and self-instructional games and puzzles is available. Individual conferences give teachers opportunities to encourage each pupil, show him specific ways he is improving, and help him learn how to learn. Materials are easily accessible for students to use in the school and in the home. Title II provided many of the materials.

C. Assistance Provided by State Subject Specialists in Selection and Use of Materials

Title II coordinators in State departments of education report that subject consultants and curriculum specialists in State departments of education have frequently assisted teachers in selecting and utilizing the printed and audiovisual materials acquired under ESEA title II. These efforts have been especially directed toward the selection and use of materials to support remedial programs for children with reading deficiencies; early childhood and bilingual programs; and instruction in the area of such social issues as drug abuse and environmental/ecological education.

Subject supervisors have frequently worked with State and local media personnel in the development of specialized bibliographies. They review title II projects concerned with their area of specialization and often monitor projects in order to assist school personnel to make the best use of materials. For example, the Rhode Island report included comments from social studies and physical education consultants who reported their efforts to bring current materials and information to teachers encouraging them to make the best use of title II funds.

One of the more interesting special-purpose grants funded under title II in Rhode Island is one at Henry Barnard School, the laboratory school for Rhode Island College at Providence. The basic concept of the project is to provide self-motivated reading and learning experiences for 60 gifted elementary school pupils in order to develop their creative and intellectual potential more fully. The State consultant for the gifted was very much involved in the development of this project and continues to work with it.

In Tennessee, the subject matter specialists worked with many local school systems during fiscal year 1971 on selection of printed and audiovisual materials. These materials were proposed under various State and Federal programs. The specialists also worked with teachers on an individual basis and in inservice education programs concerning utilization of materials and equipment acquired through programs such as ESEA title II and NDEA title III. In addition, they participated in special programs in drug education, early childhood education, and environmental education. The specialists cooperatively prepared video tapes in drug education and are planning additional ones.

In Virginia, State Supervisors assist the School Libraries staff in the review of new printed and audiovisual materials in their specific subject areas, which have been submitted by publishers, and dealers. They are, because of this practice, better able to advise local subject area supervisors and teachers in a judicious selection of materials. Maryland's special-purpose grant programs required a cooperative effort between the Division of Instruction, Division of Library Development, the local education agencies, the coordinators of the two Archdioceses, and the individual schools, including the selection of materials, for the projects.

Curriculum supervisors and consultants in the Upper Midwest States for special education and health and physical education as well as vocational education assisted teachers in the selection and utilization of media through demonstrations at faculty meetings and in-service training courses, radio and television programs, and on-site visits. Prior to submission of an actual application, but after a district has filed a letter of intent, the Ohio ESEA title II staff and other State staff assist school districts in selecting materials for a special-purpose grant. Though these grants were for reading programs, instructional materials in the area of social problems were also selected as high interest or motivational resources.

In Idaho, the State supervisors of instruction participated in the selection and utilization of media in the following ways:

- Provided local educational agencies with bibliographies of materials of high quality to be used in the selection and acquisition of school library resources and other printed and published instructional materials.

- Provided information through conferences, workshops, or direct mailings, to assist local educational agencies in interpreting criteria and standards for selection.

- Encouraged the use of multimedia in the classrooms.

The Texas Division of Program Development set certain priority programs to be emphasized during the school year. Environmental education has such a priority and division objectives were written. Schools have been encouraged to buy materials utilizing title II funds which would supplement and add to the present collection in school districts, since little material was available in environmental education until recently.

In Utah, the specialist in health education conducted one State meeting involving 180 people in the area of drug abuse education and conducted 22 regional inservice seminars for teachers. In these workshops printed and audiovisual materials were studied and resource lists of good materials developed. Displays were set up and materials examined by participants. A senior high school unit "Drug Abuse and Health" was developed which contained references, bibliographies, and teaching suggestions. At the elementary level, films and film loops in physical education have been promoted and circulated.

The Utah foreign language specialist provided consultant services in the Indian bilingual program in one district. Workshops were conducted to train teachers to teach English as a second language to kindergarten and headstart children in other districts. Print and nonprint materials were shown and demonstrated. Teachers were assisted in making effective use of printed and audiovisual materials. The specialist advised and counselled a Mexican-American class in one of the large high schools. A workshop was conducted at one of the major universities to help teachers increase their ability to individualize foreign language instruction by use of multi-media materials and encourage more participation in foreign language study by disadvantaged economic and social groups.

The Division of Indian Education in the Arizona State Department of Education prepared and distributed bibliographies of books of special interest to Indian students, and arranged book exhibits in several isolated schools so that teachers could examine them before ordering. Inservice workshops arranged by Division staff and using the services of consultants in the State Department introduced new reading materials and methods to teachers and administrators. Several visits were made to the Hopi reservation to help set up a reading center and select materials for it. Over 100 teachers from public, mission, and BIA schools participated in three workshops lasting 3 weeks each during which new materials were examined and evaluated by the participants. The workshops were arranged cooperatively with universities. Consultants for health, physical education, and recreation in the Arizona Department of Public Instruction prepared and distributed bibliographies on such subjects as drug education and helped local school personnel select materials, especially in the areas of sex and drug education. The Equal Education Opportunities Division prepared and distributed several multi-ethnic/multi-cultural bibliographies to curriculum coordinators and teachers in the State.

Consultants in the Division of Instructional Services of the Alaska State Department of Education assisted local schools in the selection and use of materials in the areas of reading, drug abuse, and environmental education.

Consultants from Educational Services Division of the Nevada State Department of Education have worked with individual teachers, principals, and librarians in selecting materials for students with special needs. The development of bibliographies for Black literature is a notable example.

The major portion of technical assistance rendered by the Consultant, Equal Educational Opportunity of the Washington State Department of Education has been in developing the multiracial and multicultural curriculum and in various ethnic study programs. This is demonstrated especially in the McCarver and Stanley elementary school programs in Tacoma and the middle schools developed in the Seattle School District. The Supervisor of Drug Education Programs provided bibliographies to the districts that received title II grants, and also provided these districts with evaluation forms with which to thoroughly evaluate the material. He also assisted librarians and instructors via telephone and letters in response to their questions and problems.

D. Use of Materials With Special Groups of Children

Under the ESEA title II program, instructional materials were made available to handicapped children enrolled in regular public and private elementary and secondary schools which either comply with the State compulsory attendance laws or are recognized by some other procedure customarily used in the State, according to the relative need of children and teachers for instructional materials. Also, instructional materials were made available, according to need, to handicapped children in special schools for the mentally or physically exceptional, where education equivalent to that of the public elementary or secondary school is provided.

In New Jersey, title II funds have been distributed to pupils in 22 institutions for the retarded and mentally ill and to pupils assigned to correctional institutions. In 1969-70 Federal funds represented 94.8 percent of funds expended for books and nearly 67 percent of funds expended for audiovisual materials in these schools.

Three of New York's special-purpose grants serve institutionalized pupils:

Reading Program for Handicapped Pupils

A wide variety of printed and audiovisual materials is available to pupils enrolled in the Amy B. Crist Special Education

Center. Reading instruction is carefully geared to each student's problem or handicap.

Remedial Reading

Small collections of reading materials of particular interest to adolescent boys are placed in the cottages at the Berkshire Farm for Boys for evening and weekend use in an effort to promote leisure reading. The pupils who range in age from 12 to 14 have reading levels from third grade to adult and need much individual help.

Attitude Toward Reading

Student problems at the George Junior Republic are in the realm of emotional, learning, and psychological blocks. Residences are being saturated with books, periodicals, and audiovisual materials.

In Massachusetts, the allocation to correctional institutions, hospitals, and schools for the mentally and physically handicapped totaled $430,889. In addition, special-purpose grants were awarded to the Manville School, Judge Baker Guidance Center in Boston and to the Ernest L. Herman School for emotionally disturbed children at Lowell.

Alabama allocates funds annually to two State industrial schools, three schools for the mentally handicapped, one school for the deaf and blind. Schools for the deaf and the mentally retarded children are provided materials in Puerto Rico. Virginia allocates funds to eight correctional institutions, two for mentally handicapped children, and one for the physically handicapped children. Twenty-one special education schools operated by local systems participate in the ESEA title II program; thirteen have central libraries. In Maryland, pupils assigned to three correctional institutions and six mental hospitals have benefited directly from the program. In the juvenile and correctional institutions, materials on drug abuse and ethnic minorities have been well received.

Every State in the Upper Midwest extended title II benefits to children in hospitals, correctional institutions and schools for the mentally and physically handicapped. The Fairfield School for Boys, an Ohio juvenile correctional institution, used its special-purpose grant for vocational materials. Resurrection Elementary School, Detroit, acquired records, filmstrips and transparencies as well as books to use with their immigrant (Albanian, Yugoslavian) children. St. Florian in Hamtramack, Mich., did likewise for its large Polish group.

Lakewood Public Schools, Lake Odessa, Mich., used ESEA title II materials for classes held at a church center for unwed teenage mothers, for a summer program for children of migrant workers, and for a drug resource center in the high school; 10 percent of ESEA title II funds were allotted to the County Intermediate Drug Information Resource Center.

In Texas, title II supports special education programs in the School for the Deaf, The School for the Blind, Gatesville State School, and other State correctional institutions and schools for the mentally and physically handicapped.

A title II Right to Read special purpose grant was made to the Navajo, Tonalea, and Ingleside Elementary Schools in Scottsdale, Ariz., for materials to help meet needs of the auditory and visually handicapped children, and a grant was made to the Arizona State School for the Deaf and Blind in Tucson. Recreational reading materials were made available to the unwed young women of school age in the Florence Crittenden Home, and a grant was made to the new Arizona Girls School in Phoenix, a correctional institution.

California continues to give attention to special programs through title II. In fiscal year 1971, one of the Phase II grants was awarded to Fricot Ranch School for Boys, a State correctional institution.

Development of Unified School Media Programs

Some States report considerable progress in developing unified school media programs in which instructional and other services related to both print and audiovisual media are administered together. Examples of the progress being made in this area are cited below:

- Title II has done more for the development of good unified media programs in the schools of Vermont than any other program or effort. Of course, the 1969 *Standards for School Media Programs* have been a great help, but the philosophy of the *Standards* would remain a philosophy without the media to put it into practice.

- Undoubtedly title II has forced many Pennsylvania schools into a unified school media program where the full range of materials is organized and made available for teachers and students. At least 40 schools have moved into a unified program.

- As a result of the availability and expenditure of title II funds for all types of media, Connecticut school systems have been forced to renovate and/or build new facilities.

> Many schools have had local funds appropriated for enlarged facilities, designed for functional and imaginative media programs where print and non-print materials are under one department.

Mississippi reports that ESEA title II has been the primary factor in stimulating the development of a unified media program in that State. Provision for library resources in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act focused national attention on the importance of school libraries in education and caused administrators to evaluate library services in their systems and plan how the services could improve the instructional program. Alabama gives ESEA title II almost total credit for developing unified media programs. The State Plan now requires that 25 percent of each school's allocation be spent for non-book materials.

In the Virgin Islands, the unified media concept has been reinforced by ESEA title II by encouraging the acquisition, organization, and use of instructional materials of various formats. In the past, Tennessee programs were planned in terms of the basic philosophy of a unified media program but funds were too limited to make a great deal of progress. ESEA title II funds have enabled the implementation of this philosophy in an outstanding manner. In Virginia, ESEA title II has been most helpful in developing unified media programs, extending the range of materials made available to students and teachers. South Carolina reports that through the past 5 years ESEA title II has made and continues to make a progressive impact on the development of unified media programs.

All Indiana secondary and junior high schools and 80 percent of the elementary schools have unified media collections. The "extra" materials provided through ESEA II and the need to make these easily accessible, and at the same time being able to account for these, provided the necessary push to centralize. In 1970, 77 percent of the Wisconsin public high schools housed both print and non-print material together, compared with 56 and 72 percent in 1966 and 1968, respectively.

The Oklahoma requirement that 70 percent of all title II funds be used for the purchase of materials cataloged and circulated from a central collection has promoted more efficient use of materials, encouraged the establishment of central libraries in schools, and resulted in a parallel employment of librarians to administer the program. This has enabled schools to concentrate stronger efforts on the acquisition of a wider range of quality materials including such items as 8mm films, filmstrips, slides, audio tapes and discs, transparencies and, in some school and regional media centers, microforms.

The Texas Education Agency's committment to the concept of the library as a collection of all types of materials appropriate to the school instructional program is reflected in the administration of title II. A large proportion of the State's nearly four thousand centralized libraries have as one of their functions the acquisition and circulation of audiovisual materials. Supporting the title II acquisition program in the non-print area are the complimentary inservice education programs offered by the Education Service Center media components to interested librarians and teachers. Workshops and consultative assistance have enabled librarians to achieve competency in equipment operation, simple production techniques, simple photographic processes, and media utilization techniques.

In Idaho, the unified media program received a great impetus with the advent of title II, and has continued to grow. The program is hindered in both elementary and secondary schools by lack of professional media personnel, educational training for them, and the comparative unfamiliarity of teaching staffs with effective utilization of multimedia. This is being remedied, however, by better opportunity for study by teachers and by inservice workshops.

With title II funds, transparencies, filmstrips, and slides have been used for some years but much more effectively now. Cassette tapes and 8mm films are being introduced, the latter in limited quantity due to the expense. At first reluctant to use paperback books because of their fragility, more and more Idaho schools are turning to them because of their popularity with students. Perhaps the only type of materials introduced in schools this year for the first time is microfiche, which can be attributed to the ERIC document service of the State Department of Education.

The term "Instructional Media Center" is now being used throughout the BIA school system. The physical facilities are being designed and remodeled to include all types of instructional materials in storage areas and utilization areas. Librarians are becoming proficient in audiovisual concepts, and all media materials are being classified and catalogued. The total media concept is gradually becoming a reality in the learning experiences of the students. Title II funding has been one of the initiating forces to bring this about.

Not only has the concept that school libraries should be total materials centers been accentuated in Hawaii, but ESEA title II funds have made it possible for some schools to develop supplementary resource centers. These have extended the central library to small centers more accessible to certain subject departments within a school.

Introduction of New Types of Media

The fiscal year 1971 reports from State departments of education continue to indicate that title II has been a very important factor in introducing into schools such newer types of materials as 8mm films, art prints, microfilm, paperback books, and transparencies. The scope of title II impact in expanding the types of media is illustrated by the following excerpts from New York's report for fiscal year 1971:

> Various types of materials such as 8mm films, art prints, microform, paperback books, transparencies, etc. have in varying degree, been introduced into New York schools for the first time. Initial acquisition is also being made of silent and sound filmstrips, disc recordings, slides, microfilm, and study prints. Most notable this year were acquisitions in audio cassettes. They were favored over disc and conventional tape recordings at a 6:1 ratio. The improvement of the content of tape cassettes as well as the ease with which they can be shelved, circulated and used appears to be largely responsible for their growing acceptance. Paperback book acquisition has been initiated in many schools in an attempt to stretch the dollar and make a greater variety of materials available to pupils. The greatest impact of title II regarding audiovisual materials has been their availability for the first time to students. Prior to the ESEA title II program, the local district considered them solely as teacher resources, thus limiting their potential effectiveness.

Applications in larger and older collections indicate that title II funds have been helpful in breaking the rigidity of line item budgets which indicated books only for New Jersey school libraries. Montclair High School with $10 per pupil for books, used title II for the purchase of transparencies and filmstrips. Several schools have begun art print collections, and many schools, hesitant to use local funds for 8mm films, were willing to experiment with title II funds.

The impact of title II is apparent in all New Hampshire schools, but perhaps most dramatically in the smallest primary schools (grades K-3, 1-4, etc.), whose local funds would scarcely permit purchase of filmstrips, transparencies, or art prints. But purchase of such materials from title II funds at the district, supervisory union, or regional level, has provided for new and delightful avenues to learning.

Alabama reports practically all schools having a nucleus of nonprint materials obtained through ESEA title II, including tapes, recordings, filmstrips, study prints, and loops. In the District of Columbia, ESEA title II is responsible for adding cassette tapes, art prints, transparencies, and single concept films. While most schools in Maryland had utilized the newer types of media, ESEA title II funds made them available more quickly. Microfilm is becoming more available, particularly where NDEA title III funds were used to purchase readers and reader-printers. Puerto Rico has been able to purchase 8mm and 16mm films in Spanish for the first time, as well as posters based on Latin American culture and local environment, and especially designed for a compensatory science program. In Tennessee, transparencies, microform, and 8mm films are being used for the first time. South Carolina finds paperback books to be the most requested type of new material, with 8mm films also being purchased.

In Mississippi, fiscal year 1971 has been the "year of programed instruction." Many new programed devices have been introduced as an attempt to solve the reading problems which appeared after the unitary system was established. Many of these programed materials and devices have been acquired and disseminated through the central library. Although paperback books have been included in library collections for many years, they have become increasingly popular as "give away" items in school libraries. This practice has been provided through other Federal programs to encourage reading. In most school districts, paperback books may be found in library collections, in classrooms, in teachers' lounges, or wherever needed for easy accessibility.

For many schools in a financial crisis, ESEA title II offers the only opportunity for schools to introduce materials beyond the basic instructional materials. Microform use has increased considerably in high schools. Three-fourths of Wisconsin acquisition funds went to purchase audiovisual materials, while Missouri reported a decrease to 25 percent for the same types of purchases. Most of the larger schools in South Dakota now have 8mm films, records, tapes, slides, filmstrips, transparencies. Though availability of funds has been partially responsible for schools purchasing these newer forms of media to a greater extent, inservice workshops, short courses, and State department of education consultative assistance have interested professional personnel in using these.

At the Texas regional education centers, the Special Education Instructional Materials Centers are examination centers for new materials, educational games, manipulative devices, and media in all formats. The centers are open to all teachers in the region.

Through the Texas Education Agency, Division of School Accreditation, many schools with limited funds have been encouraged to acquire paperbacks, participate in regional media collections, and develop locally produced materials.

The Department of Education in American Samoa used title II funds to purchase over 5,000 paperbacks which students love. Some of the books have been circulated as many as 20 times. Emphasis on individualized learning in the State of Washington and cuts in instructional materials budgets at the local level have resulted in significant increases in paperback collections throughout the schools in Washington State. Forty-two districts received special needs grants for fiscal year 1971. The following list shows the type of material and the number of districts (among the forty-two) reporting introduction of this type of materials into the schools for the first time:

Type of Material	Number of Districts
Microfilm	2
Microfiche	1
Transparencies	3
Study prints	2
Cassette tapes	3
Multi media materials	1
Filmstrips	3
Paperbacks	5
8mm	3
Videotapes	1
Film loops	1

Most Oregon schools, prior to title II, received nearly 100 percent of their audiovisual materials from either the district office or in most cases the county audiovisual center. Records show that schools are now acquiring more of such materials as 8mm, art prints, study prints, etc. and are making them available to teachers and students without the usual delay of ordering and waiting.

Procedures Used by State Departments of Education in Evaluating Title II and the Results

Although few States have available the results of evaluative procedures used to measure the implementation and outcomes of the objectives formulated for title II for fiscal year 1971, some progress has been made in the evaluation of title II.

In April of 1970, a comprehensive questionnaire on all aspects of the school library program in New York was initiated, including study of holdings in all media resources and equipment, facilities, personnel, administrative patterns, budget, etc. Phase II of the study provided for a comprehensive analysis of the data. The first draft of this analysis has been completed and will be ready for dissemination shortly. The third and final phase of the study will gather data to provide the basis for qualitative analysis through on-site visits and interviews. This phase should be completed in fiscal year 1972.

Due to limitation of staff, evaluation procedures to measure the implementation and outcome of the title II program in New Hampshire has been chiefly informal and limited to "feedback" from local school administrators, librarians, and classroom teachers. It is hoped that systematic assistance in planning and evaluation will soon become available from the new unit established under Section 402 of the General Education Provisions Act.

Massachusetts reported considerable progress on a very comprehensive field and questionnaire survey of the first 4 years of the title II program. This study was designed to secure direction for the program's future activities. Data were collected on staff size, hours of service, and extent of development of unified media programs. A narrative report of this evaluation is in progress. Preliminary conclusions indicate that school media services in Massachusetts have almost doubled since the inception of title II. Although the distance the State has come is great, the data indicate many unmet needs.

New Jersey reported on two studies related to the title II program. Both studies were conducted by graduate students at Rutgers, The State University, and made use of the data bank available from the title II office in the State Department of Education. One study developed criteria for the identification of effective media centers in New Jersey schools. These data formed the basis for two reports on effective media centers which have been widely disseminated for use by school personnel who wish to visit the schools where superior media programs are in operation. 1/

The other study explored the feasibility of establishing interlibrary loan networks among public secondary school libraries to increase the quantity and diversity of resources for independent study beyond those available in each school. 2/ The study indicated that unique book titles constituted almost half the titles from 12 sampled topics, refuting the assumption that secondary school library collections are basically similar. In addition, 31.4 percent of the titles studied were not owned by any of the public libraries in the study. Thus, the study shows that secondary school libraries have a high potential for strengthening certain portions of their collections through interlibrary loan.

1/ Innovative Physical Provisions in School Media Centers. Release No. 1. Programs of Media Centers Recommended for Visiting and Observation. Release No. 2. Library Development Committee, New Jersey School Media Association, New Brunswick, New Jersey, November 1971.

2/ Altman, Ellen. The Resource Capacity of Public Secondary School Libraries to Support Interlibrary Loan. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. New Brunswick, Rutgers, The State University, 1971.

There were no formal studies by other agencies of the ESEA title II program in the southeastern States in fiscal year 1971. Kentucky contracted with a specialist for an evaluation of procedures used to measure the implementation and outcomes of the objectives formulated for the program for the past fiscal year, to be completed in fiscal year 1972. In Puerto Rico, two studies related to textbooks were conducted:

1. need and estimated cost of textbooks in use
2. estimated cost of new books recommended in the curriculum revision

Virginia's annual evaluation of the ESEA title II Demonstration Libraries showed their continued growth and worth. A division superintendent, after visiting one of the Demonstration Libraries, threw out the traditional design planned for a new school in favor of a true media center. Alabama conducts an annual evaluation of the results of ESEA title II each October when the required survey reports are received from each public and private school. A study is underway which should indicate that school library programs have increased in number, resources, and personnel. The objectives of this program include the development of library programs adequate to serve the curricular needs of the schools of Alabama. ESEA title II has provided the impetus which should lead to this goal within the next decade.

Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin were the only States in the Upper Midwest to undertake an evaluation of the implementation and outcomes of ESEA title II objectives. North Dakota planned to use data from the Consolidated Program Information Record of the United States Office of Education. The Illinois State Summary showed that 200 new public elementary media centers and 41 public high school media centers, and 21 nonpublic elementary centers and five nonpublic high schools were opened during 1970-71. More than 4,308 public and nonpublic school media centers were expanded and 2,746,327 children and 132,815 teachers in public and private schools were served. Local effort to provide media when compared to the previous year was not maintained:

	Public Elem.	High	Non Public Elem.	High
Fiscal Year 1970	5.02	6.69	2.51	3.94
Fiscal Year 1971	4.22	5.61	2.20	3.46
Change	-.80	-1.08	-.31	-.48

The Indiana inventory and evaluative study reported:

An increase of 78 new instructional media centers; a decrease of 37 separate AV and library programs; a decrease of 26 classroom collections; an increase of 25 professional media personnel.

The Wisconsin ESEA title II inventory of public elementary and secondary schools revealed the following:

	391 High Schools	200 Junior High	780 Elementary
Staff	-		
Librarians	451	187	493
AV	77	32	40
Central facilities	100%	98%	51%
Book Collections Meeting Min. Standards	38%	28%	27%
Expenditures for books Meeting Min. Standards	25%	11%	12%
Books per student	12	10	13
Books expenditures per pupil in schools with centralized facilities	$4.74	$4.10*	$3.62*
AV expenditures per pupil	$2.59	$1.93*	$1.24*

Since 1968, 319 centralized school libraries have been established; however, 754 public schools still have no centralized library facilities.

The Oklahoma title II staff have assisted and advised a doctoral candidate at Oklahoma State University in a survey regarding resource centers in elementary schools. The survey covered such areas as centralized collections, professional services, teacher aides, clerical assistance, audiovisual resources, and professional collections. This survey was sent to a cross section of elementary schools in Oklahoma.

The Idaho Right to Read special-purpose grants had an evaluation section as an integral part of each project. An instrument has been designed to be used in these projects, to measure the outcome of the objectives established for each project. The instruments have been given to each of the project directors and each has discussed it with the State staff. The projects were approved in January, 1970 and the materials were ordered prior to June 30, 1971 but it will be June 30, 1972 before there can be a valid evaluation of this activity.

In January the State Board approved a Plan for Texas Study of Public School Instructional Resources. The central goal of the 18-month study is "a coordinated system for making appropriate instructional materials and equipment available to all schools." If such a system is feasible, the study will have the additional goal of "a plan for implementation of the system."

The parameters of the study include the following components:

- All materials and equipment, including title II acquisitions, used by instructional personnel to support the learning-teaching process.
- Professional and technical personnel involved in the media area.

The four objectives of the study are:

- Determining the present status of instructional resources in Texas public schools - what are they, where are they, how are they being delivered, how well are they being delivered and used, etc. (Phase I)
- Determining the "ideal" system for the State (Phase II)
- Assessing needs (the difference between current status and "ideal") (Phase III)
- Planning implementation (Phase IV)

Because the study should involve numbers of people with diverse backgrounds and interests, its design must reach "grass roots" information and opinion. The study will make recommendations with far reaching implications -- legislative action, State and local board policy actions, new or modified ways of delivering instruction resources, therefore, its design must generate interest, reaction, and support. It is recommended that a State level structure include an advisory commission, agency staff, and a steering committee assigned to the study, and a regional structure -- 20 study groups generating "grass roots" involvement through local meetings at crucial points in the 17-month program.

Specific procedures for evaluating the California ESEA title II program are still being formulated, but the model is practically complete, and progress is being made on the implementation of the outcome measures. The following documents have been completed: Rationale of Evaluation Instrument, Objectives and Needs Instrument, Design of Instrument. Work is being done concurrently on an Evaluation Instrument for the total school media program in the State.

Five program goals for title II were listed in the Washington State Department of Education biennial budget estimates. Two are listed below:

Program Goal A - Increase the numbers and varieties of materials available to small school districts through increased participation of such districts in the title II program as either single applicants or through cooperative projects.

Evaluation A comparison of the number of school districts and intermediate school districts participating in the title II program will be made.

Result INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL DISTRICT PARTICIPATION IN THE ESEA TITLE II PROGRAM

	1970	1971
Special Needs Grants	5	3
Cooperatives	0	3
Allotment	$65,200	$34,000
Children served (Public & Private)	210,454	78,425
Teachers served (Public & Private)	70,037	3,598

SCHOOL DISTRICTS PARTICIPATING IN ESEA TITLE II

	1970	1971
	# of Districts	
Regular Grants	245	287
Special Needs Grants	33	42*

Program Goal B - Increased integration of all Federal programs concerned with the effective use of learning resources, equipment, staff, and facilities, both in the schools of the State and within the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Evaluation Number of programs requested with coordinated funding and district and agency feedback on reaction to coordinated funding.

Result COORDINATED FUNDING REPORTS

	1970	1971
ESEA Title I	91	155
ESEA Title I (Migrant)	9	32
ESEA Title III	3	26
NDEA Title III	72	143
Other	3	17

Dissemination Activities

In fiscal year 1971, several States made special efforts to use new and creative techniques in disseminating information about the title II program to school administrators, school board members, and other influential groups. For example, title II in Pennsylvania developed a slide presentation concerning title II and the role of the examination centers to show to school administrators and other groups. Title II staff in Connecticut prepared and presented a program on Statewide educational television. New York also reported using information about title II in an NBC television program on an ESEA title III project.

Nearly every State reported that title II staff issued periodic newsletters to disseminate information. The report from Massachusetts is typical:

> The bimonthly newsletter produced by the school library media staff of the Bureau of Library Extension continued to be the prime source of dissemination of title II program information in fiscal year 1971. Requests for copies to be mailed directly to library media specialists increased with every issue; by the end of the year we were distributing well over 3,000 copies to public and private elementary and secondary schools.

In addition, many reports commented on the various conferences attended by title II staff where they often had the opportunity to speak on title II and the support it provides to instructional programs. Newspaper coverage, particularly of the special-purpose grants, is another frequently mentioned dissemination technique. Vermont reported very good coverage of the special-purpose grant funded at East Montpelier.

Other methods of dissemination widely used in all States included the distribution of mimeographed material, personal on-site visitations, and telephone conversations. Brochures on various aspects of the program have been prepared in New York, Pennsylvania, and New Hampshire. Articles on title II have appeared in State and regional educational and library journals.

For the most part the States of the Southeast continue to use tried and true techniques for dissemination of information about the ESEA title II program. These included educational television, brochures, newspaper articles, radio and television publicity, conferences, and department newsletters. In Maryland, the State Administrator for ESEA title II was invited to speak at the Conference on Independent Schools sponsored by the Maryland State Department of Education to present facts about the program. Two regional workshops were held in the Archdiocese of Washington, where explanations were made regarding the participation of private schools in the ESEA title II program. In Puerto Rico, exhibits of instructional materials packages available from ESEA title II were held in September and in May. Materials locally designed and produced as well as commercially produced materials were included. Virginia's "Road Show" slide presentation has been an effective and colorful technique and is available for loan to school personnel around the State.

The Michigan report included examples of new and creative techniques:

> Greenville Public Schools placed signs and posters about title II in the Chamber of Commerce display window; Monroe Public Schools used a radio slot to tell about federally-funded programs; Kentwood Public Schools produced a video tape about the reading program and its use of ESEA II materials; Tower Heights School (an adjunct of a State mental hospital) hosted a meeting of State legislators and the probate judge; Portage Public Schools had five displays of new materials during the year; Holy Childhood School, Indian boarding school, had a project on Indian Culture, which became a part of a television program on Indians in Michigan.

During fiscal year 1971, Alaska initiated a newsletter to disseminate information about title II. Arizona publishes a newsletter and also contributes to a magazine report which has included information about and photographs of title II activities. The Arizona title II administrator has made a presentation to the Arizona Board of Education and in her capacity as a member of the Executive Board of the School Libraries Division of the State Library Association gives a progress report at each meeting. Copies of "Libraries Are Kid Stuff," a film about the library program at the Myers Elementary School in Tucson, circulate from the title II office. The Myers project is an ESEA title III project which title II funds have helped support.

Dissemination of information is a required component of the title II special grant program in California. Each local school unit must state in its project application the techniques to be used in disseminating information about its program. There is an emphasis upon student participation in this effort through the preparation of presentations made to the public. Students and media personnel have appeared on television and radio programs as well as at local service organizations. Many slide-tapes, 8mm films, and 16mm films have been prepared by students in schools where there are special grants, and these have been presented to local school boards and other community groups. The State supervisory staff of title II was particularly successful in disseminating information about the program to influential groups among educators and communities. On several occasions members of the staff were interviewed by local radio and television stations and asked to explain the importance of the title II program to the public. One staff member has worked closely with the State Parent-Teachers Association and regularly attends their meetings.

Slide/tape shows of three of the Washington State Special Needs Grant projects were prepared: HOP Program (Steveson,Carson), LAST TWO FRONTIERS (Richland), and COMMUNICATIONS UNLIMITED (West Valley, Yakima). These shows were presented at various local and State meetings and are available on loan to educators in the State. A series of television programs was prepared in the title II project "Environmental Materials Center" (Sedro, Woolley) which stressed the ecological relationship of man and his environment and the importance of a need for an awareness of esthetics in man's psychological relationship to his environment. A television adaptation of this program was presented on KVOS, a commercial television station in Bellingham.

Information about the title II programs was included in Your Public Schools, a periodical sent to all educators in Washington State.

Most schools in Oregon have "open house" once each year. The library-media people enjoy displaying materials purchased with title II funds. These materials are identified as title II purchases while on display. This also occurs frequently at PTA meetings. In many instances the local news media have given recognition and support to the title II program.

The year 1971 saw the organization of the Trust Territory's first board of education for the entire territory. At the second meeting of this important group, the title II administrator was able to make a presentation in considerable detail on ESEA title II. A departmental newsletter was reactivated during the year, and a forthcoming issue will feature various items concerning title II. The administrator has also made presentations to club groups and high school classes. A major effort to communicate the new Right to Read program was made by utilization of National Library Week promotional materials designed for this purpose. Displays were featured at the State Agency and at high school libraries. The title II administrator introduced a reader interest survey at this time which is still continuing.

7. NEEDS

Although title II has made a substantial contribution to increased quantities of instructional materials, contributed to State school media programs through title II administrative funds, and stimulated employment of local school media personnel, the reports from State departments of education show continued and critical needs for materials and media staff.

Critical Needs for Materials

Needs for all types of instructional materials exist in nearly all subject areas and grade levels. The needs are still acute because many schools have never attained a minimum number of materials of high quality to meet the basic requirements of elementary and secondary school instruction. Needs to update materials and to provide media for curriculum innovations and newer methods of teaching are continuing. There is also a critical need for relevant materials that deal with contemporary social issues such as the Black experience, drug abuse, ecology, and crime. The following reports from several Northeastern States indicate the scope of need:

> Connecticut: Need for all kinds of media at all grade levels and in all subject areas. The goal of a media center in each Connecticut school has not been met.
>
> Delaware: Materials needed to improve all basic course offerings, especially reading, the social studies, and career education. Programs to individualized instruction implies a continued need for library materials, with an increased demand for audiovisual materials for pupil use.
>
> Massachusetts: Greatest immediate need continues to exist at the elementary level, despite the fact that elementary libraries almost doubled between 1966 and 1970. Secondary school collections lack the necessary scope and breadth. The need for materials is great in all subject areas. Most existing media programs are not capable of providing the variety of alternatives to textbook-centered instruction that educational programs should be demanding.
>
> New Hampshire: The greatest need is for elementary school library resources, both printed and audiovisual, in the areas of art, humanities, social studies, English, and reading.
>
> New Jersey: Specific areas of need are: high interest-low vocabulary reading; books and filmstrips in Spanish; environmental/ecological education; Black studies; and local and State history, especially at it relates to Black studies.
>
> New York: Subject area needs relate to an increasing tendency to use interdisciplinary approaches to instruction. The greatest need is for materials which are comprehensive, timely, and relevant. Materials for elementary (K-6) and middle (5-8) schools still have not achieved the depth needed to support new programs. For secondary schools, periodicals on microfilm are needed.

Pennsylvania: Greatest need is still for high-interest, low-vocabulary materials for both boys and girls, particularly for pupils in secondary schools. There is lack of sufficient materials on fine arts for elementary school use.

The following table shows critical needs for materials by subject area, grade level, and type of media in the States of the Southeast:

States or Other Areas	Critical Needs for Media by: Subject Area	Grade Level	Type of Media
Alabama	All subject areas	Elementary	Printed and Audiovisual Media
Georgia	All subject areas	All levels	Printed and Audiovisual Media
Kentucky	All subject areas	All levels	Printed and Audiovisual Media
Maryland	Social Problems Languages(Spanish)	Middle School	Newer types of Audio-visual Media
Mississippi	All subject areas	All levels	Printed and Audiovisual Media
South Carolina	-	Elementary	Newer types of Audio-visual Media
Tennessee	-	All levels	Printed and Audiovisual Media
Virginia	Selection Aids Social Problems Science	All levels	Newer types of Audio-visual Media
West Virginia	-	All levels	Printed and Audiovisual Media
District of Columbia	Reading Mathematics	All levels	Printed and Audiovisual Media
Puerto Rico	Languages(Spanish) Professional books	All levels	Newer types of Audio-visual Media
Virgin Islands	-	All levels	Printed and Audiovisual Media

Critical needs for media in the area of developmental reading were expressed by Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, North and South Dakota, and Wisconsin are among States where many schools still lack centralized media centers. Indiana and North Dakota indicated need for school library books, while Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, and Michigan reported need for audiovisual materials. South Dakota also reported need for realia; i.e., three-dimensional objects, museum materials, dioramas, models, and samples.

The following of the Upper Midwest States expressed needs for media in the following subject areas:

Indiana	Environmental/ecological education
Iowa	Career education, early childhood education, professional materials
North Dakota	Current reference sources
South Dakota	Environmental/ecological education, American Indians, drug abuse

The 10 Mid-Continent States expressed universal need for audiovisual materials and materials in all subject areas, especially for elementary school grades. Montana reported that an analysis of the State accreditation reports indicate elementary schools continue to show the greatest need for library books and other instructional materials in a variety of subject areas. A need still exists for central libraries in many of the schools to assist in facilitating the media center concept of instruction.

The Texas report indicates specific materials that are needed to support the instructional program.

- Materials in all formats, grade levels, and subject areas to implement alternate curriculums reflecting ethnic and minority views, life styles, cultures, and learning styles.
- Career education materials in all formats for grades, K-6, to support the career education curriculum introduced this year into elementary schools.
- Spanish language materials and English language materials in all formats at elementary grade levels to further implement bilingual instruction and learning.

- Materials in all formats to support individualized instruction in local education agency identified priority content areas aligned with the Right to Read effort.

- Visual materials that are inductive in approach in the English Language Arts content area at all grade levels.

As might be expected, those subject areas included in the NDEA title III program have fared better than the excluded areas, and again secondary schools have benefited more than elementary schools except in cities employing elementary school librarians. Larger school systems have had the personnel and the competencies to take advantage of Federal programs to a greater extent than have the very small schools.

Public school library collections and services are generally superior to those found in private schools. Evidence collected from private schools indicates that secondary school library collections are better in all respects than those in elementary schools. The private school administrators expressed the consensus that priority needs in the private schools were in the area of library resources of all types, but particularly books at all grade levels.

Participating districts in the State of Washington reported the greatest needs in the subject areas for the types of materials listed below, in order of priority:

	Elementary		Secondary	
	Subject Areas	Types of Media	Subject Areas	Types of Media
1.	Reading	Books	Individualized Instruction	Books
2.	Individualized Instruction	Filmstrips	Drug Abuse	Recordings
3.	Environmental/ Ecological Education	Recordings	Environmental/ Ecological Education	Filmstrips
4.	Drug Abuse	Pamphlets	Reading	8mm film
5.	Culturally Deprived	-	Culturally Deprived	-

A variety of software is needed in Alaska's small elementary schools and in those larger schools changing from the traditional approach to the individualized instruction concept.

Needs for materials in American Samoa are fundamental. Before fiscal year 1970, practically nothing in the way of instructional materials had been provided unless related to telecasts. In Arizona, each school was requested to make its own needs assessment. Most frequently listed were materials to enhance reading programs, especially high-interest, low-vocabulary items at all levels. Materials for bilingual students and materials relevant to various ethnic groups in the State were also high on the list. With increased emphasis on career education at elementary levels and on drug education, both areas were often cited as having gaps in library collections. Several schools needed special kinds of materials--film loops, microfilm for newer equipment recently purchased, for example. A number of schools felt print collections were fairly adequate, but that there was a real need in nonprint materials. Since State aid is now given for kindergarten programs, many schools needed materials for this level.

Correlating with the identification of reading as first priority by the Nevada Statewide needs assessment, ESEA title II personnel in local school districts, school librarians, and reading specialists have expressed a need for high-interest, low-vocabulary materials, particularly in the intermediate grades.

The most recent California evaluative data shows that the elementary schools continue to lag in both book and audiovisual materials. The average through the State shows approximately six books per child on the elementary level. The standards, as adopted by the State Board of Education, show that the elementary schools lack nearly 20,000,000 volumes to enjoy a minimum standard. High school programs approach the standards in book-per-student ratio with nearly nine per student. Audiovisual materials show a much greater degree of need. Filmstrips, for instance, presently are less than one-fourth the number required to meet the standards. Eight-millimeter films fare even less well. The latest records indicate a total of fewer than 50,000 were owned as compared with 3,300,000 necessary to meet the current standards. Humanities and multi-ethnic areas continue to fall into the category of great need. Reading materials especially designed for the 1st, 6th, and 11th grades will be in demand due to an emphasis on the academic reading program by the State Department of Education and the National Right to Read effort.

In Hawaii, needs for all types of materials, in every curriculum area, and for every grade level have been expressed. In the questionnaire distributed to the schools at the title II meetings in November, they were asked to list the types of material needed, in the order of their priorities. Only 18 percent of the responses indicated books as their number one priority. Of the 82 percent that listed audiovisual materials, the largest number indicated a need for filmstrips; however, all other types of audiovisual materials were listed.

Critical needs by subject and grade level and percentage of schools showing these needs are cited below:

Subject Area	Grade Level
27% Social Studies	41% Elementary Grades (4-6)
22% Science	29% Primary (K-3)
21% Language Arts	19% Intermediate (7-8)
12% Mathematics	11% Secondary (9-12)
18% Other Areas	

Within the specific grades, the fourth grade was mentioned the most often as a level of critical need, with the fifth and sixth grades cited (in that order) as close runners-up. Some of the other needs which require large quantities of newer, unique and more sophisticated materials may be listed as follows:

a. Interesting and easy-to-understand materials for beginners, slow learners, and children with handicaps that impede the learning process.

b. The need for materials related to vocational education continues to be high. Reference materials pertaining to trades, industries, and careers are much needed.

c. New and greater emphasis is now being placed on economics, political science, local government, and international relations.

d. Psychology, sex education, drugs and narcotics require more and newer instructional materials.

e. Computer technology, oceanography, the cultural heritage of minority groups, moral and ethical values are all part of the big picture. Materials of all kinds are needed to support the new curriculums.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs reports that:

> Materials to help Indian youngsters understand themselves and evaluate their goals and how they can be what they want to be need to be developed. This requires a combination of cultural materials, self-analysis materials, and career education materials. Cultural materials for both elementary and secondary school youngsters need to be made available. Much is being done but more relevant materials should be made available to all Indian pupils to learn about themselves and the contributions of their people. The problem of the deaf in the Indian-Eskimo

cultures has not been met and suitable materials are needed. Media in the native Indian Languages for primary grades need development and utilization. This would enhance the flow into the bilingual instructional media which needs continual revision and expansion.

Manpower Needs

Manpower needs in State departments of education to administer school media programs have been greatly alleviated since the passage of ESEA title II. For example, in the six New England States, only Connecticut and Massachusetts had a State school library supervisor prior to 1965. Now Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont have at least one media supervisor; however, to furnish the unique and important activities involved in a planned program of developing and improving unified and comprehensive school media services, additional personnel is needed in most States. Of the 10 northeastern States, only Maine indicated that the number of staff personnel was adequate to administer the media program. Manpower needs for a sample of the States are shown below:

> Delaware: The two positions of library supervisor and audiovisual supervisor have been combined. This should result in more integration of media activities, but it seriously reduces the amount of developmental assistance which can be given to local education agencies.
>
> New Hampshire: A position in the area of instructional media was established in fiscal year 1971 and will be filled in 1972.
>
> New Jersey: A coordinated library/audiovisual staff with additional consultants to work with 21 counties.
>
> New York: Although there may be needs for additional staff, the greatest need is a careful reexamination and evaluation of the functions and tasks needed to administer excellent school media programs.
>
> Pennsylvania: At least three professional media specialists are needed to carry on even a minimum program for the State.
>
> Rhode Island: There is need for an additional State media specialist and for an auditor to assist with fiscal supervision.
>
> Vermont: The request to the State legislature for the much needed audiovisual specialist has been repeatedly turned down.

> Massachusetts: The title II staff in fiscal year 1971 had more contact with Massachusetts educators than in any previous year, due to an increase in positions filled and a reduction in staff turnover. Three staff members visited over 600 public and private schools. Since media programs are still viewed in many schools as a support service, it is important that the ESEA title II program be used to convince administrators of their necessity and to demonstrate their effectiveness. This requires vital, informed persuasive professionals attached to the State title II program, and there are simply not enough of them in Massachusetts to perform necessary promotional and monitoring tasks.

Additional professional library and media personnel are needed in the State departments of education of Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Virginia and West Virginia also report need for technicians or production specialists.

Of the States of the Upper Midwest, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, and Wisconsin reported need for professional media and administrative staff. Michigan noted that its need to add staff was to recoup losses sustained when the appropriation was so low in fiscal year 1970.

Nebraska reported need for a reading specialist to work in the title II program, while North Dakota noted that lack of office space precluded employment of needed State personnel.

In Montana the greatest manpower need is for supervisors at the State level to assist in the development of libraries and to provide inservice training for teachers and librarians. For the past year, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction has needed a library supervisor but, owing to lack of funds and the difficulty in finding a qualified person, the office has been unable to fill the position.

Wyoming reports that if requests for on-site consultant visitations continue at the present rate, there will soon be a need for either another full-time person or for funds to use local media specialists as part-time consultants.

In Texas, limited supervisory and consultative services to over 1,100 local districts are available from a State staff of three librarians and one audiovisual specialist. The size of the State and the large number of districts precludes more than token assistance to individual districts or schools. Inservice education on a county basis and upon request provides only a partial solution to the need and demand for professional help. A more realistic State supervisory program would require at least 20 more professional librarians with one based in each of the 20 new educational service centers to direct a regional program coordinated with the regional media (audio-visual) component that already exists.

An additional media specialist is needed at the Guam State Agency to improve the quality and utilization of materials acquired under title II.

Supervising personnel in the California State Department of Education spend the majority of time working with the Phase II schools and, therefore, are forced to neglect the Phase I portion of their responsibility. Additional positions are needed to develop a better quality program.

Manpower needs at the Hawaii State Education Agency continue to be an area of critical concern. The ESEA title II office lost all its clerical help when the Federal appropriation was cut by more than 50 percent in 1968-69. Since that time the program has operated with student help, part-time help (borrowed from other sections of this branch), cafeteria workers on a part-time basis during the summer months, and over-time workers, when available. In January 1971, a justification was written for reassignment of clerical workers. Approval was received in June, and two typists were employed.

The Federal Relations and Programs Branch of the Nevada State Department of Education currently has inadequate consultative staff for the administration of ESEA title II. Both the Nevada State Education Association and the Nevada State Librarians Association have by resolution requested a full-time library consultant in the Curriculum and Instruction Branch.

The Alaska State Education Agency needs a full-time media and school library consultant. The position had been filled for 6 months in 1969; after remaining unfilled for over a year, and it was abolished by the last State Legislature.

The present State staff in Arizona is very limited because of space constraints. When the new education building is completed in June 1972, the title II office will be housed in the media center of the new building and two professional positions will be added to the staff. The services of the Department will be extended, and all existing collections of the libraries of all departments -- drug education, special education, vocational education, adult education -- will be merged. The center will serve as an examination center for new materials, both print and nonprint, for all school personnel.

In the 1971 narrative reports on the administration of ESEA title II, a number of States made specific references to media manpower needs in school district central offices:

> Delaware: Only 10 of the 23 school districts have a library/media coordinator. The financial committment of the school district and the committment of school administrators are primary factors in the establishment of these positions. Of the remaining 13 districts, all but two are of adequate size to support a media supervisor.
>
> New Jersey: Although there are very few district media coordinators, several positions have been abolished because of budgetary reductions.
>
> Pennsylvania: Only 80 new positions have been added in a 3-year period to bring the total to 104; almost 400 school districts are without media supervisors.
>
> Rhode Island: The number of school district media supervisors has reached 12, but there is still a great need for coordinators in smaller communities. Several school districts have lost media staff in budget cuts.

Among Southeastern States, Alabama, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia and the District of Columbia and Virgin Islands report need for school district media supervisors.

In the Upper Midwest, Illinois reported that the local districts dropped media staff because of financial problems and that such positions needed to be reinstated. Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Wisconsin also report that many school district central offices have no media consultants. In Michigan, for example only 35 of 721 operating districts have full-time media supervisors; however, between 35 and 40 have building librarians who also serve as supervisors. Of Wisconsin's 444 districts, 46 have district supervisors.

In Texas, 48 library supervisors are employed in cities or private systems, an increase of 10 supervisors in the last year. Only three districts provide more than one trained supervisor. Many of the recently appointed supervisors in the medium-sized districts possess only minimum certification requirements, 18 semester hours of library sciences, and frequently operate the elementary school library program with the assistance of untrained aids, clerks, or volunteers. In addition to supervisors, school districts employed 2,674 school librarians in fiscal year 1971, which is an increase of 117 librarians over last year.

Wyoming reports that need for 11 positions, either as district coordinators or assistant district coordinators of media services. Within the next 2 years this figure will probably increase by 50 percent.

Most of the larger districts in urban areas in Arizona employ both librarians and audiovisual supervisors; others have one or the other to serve in both capacities. The local school districts seem more interested in meeting quantitative standards than in providing funds for adequate staff to administer programs.

Additional instructional media personnel should be provided in school district offices, particularly in the medium and larger-sized districts in Arizona. These persons could be of assistance in the selection of instructional materials and equipment, could train teachers and pupils in the use of these items, and supervise activities related to title II.

The district and building level media personnel in California also fall below needs, and the number of building level librarians is less than one-third of that required to meet the minimum standard adopted by the State Board of Education.

Of the 14 Intermediate School Districts in Washington State, nine employ a learning resources or instructional media person and eight employ a Federal Project Coordinator; however, many have other administrative responsibilities and are unable to devote sufficient time to help the local school districts plan, develop, and implement effective projects. There is need for more media personnel to serve small districts.

Although the title II program has had substantial impact on the employment of media personnel in elementary and secondary schools, the number of schools still unserved by professional personnel is very high. Elementary schools and all schools in smaller school districts are in greater need of media staff than other types of schools. Several States noted cutbacks in local school media personnel because of general personnel cuts. Pennsylvania and Delaware reported a tendency to replace professional media staff with lower paid clerks, aides, and technicians. The report from New Hampshire stated:

> Qualified school library personnel at the elementary school level is much needed. As the library facility develops in our elementary schools, the services of qualified people are desperately needed. In some instances, local school systems have been able to move toward meeting this need through the employment of library aides. A particular need exists, however, to provide a training program for this type of personnel. A need also exists for trained media personnel. As more sophisticated audiovisual materials become available for use by teachers in the schools, it is necessary to provide assistance through the services of qualified persons.

The Massachusetts survey shows clearly a continuing need for professional and supportive library media staff at the school level. Only about one half the school libraries are staffed with professionals, and less than 500 school libraries (of 1,457 in the State) have full-time professionals to operate them. The same number have the use of at least part-time clerical assistance. There are even more school libraries which have benefit of neither professional nor clerical staff.

A survey of the public school libraries in New York conducted in the spring of 1970 revealed the following staffing pattern by grade span for school librarians:

> Full-time certified librarians were employed in 29 percent of the primary schools, 47 percent of the elementary schools, 86 percent of the middle schools, 94 percent of the high schools, and 66 percent of the schools with various grade combinations. Part-time certified librarians were employed in 32 percent of the primary schools, 16 percent of the elementary schools, 3 percent of the middle schools, 5 percent of the high schools, and 26 percent of the schools with various grade combinations. There were no certified librarians employed in 37 percent of the primary schools, 36 percent of the elementary schools, 11 percent of the middle schools, 5 percent of the high schools, and 26 percent of the schools with various grade combinations.

In the Southeast, need for professional media personnel in local schools was reported by Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Alabama and West Virginia report particular need for personnel to serve in elementary schools; Virginia reports that larger schools need additional media staff. Alabama, Georgia, Maryland, Mississippi, and Virginia are also in need of clerical or paraprofessional staff.

In the Upper Midwest, all States reported need for media staff in school. In Kansas, 160 elementary schools have no library or librarian. Nebraska needs professional staff for elementary school libraries presently served only by clerks. Missouri also needs elementary school media specialists to staff the many newly established elementary school libraries.

Well over 75 librarians and/or media specialist are needed in Wyoming. Many of the schools included in this estimate have only a part-time aide to conduct minimum check-out activities. Some have a part-time professional librarian to oversee, direct, and work with the aide and teachers, but most do not.

Although the needs vary considerably district to district in Utah, the most obvious need is that of professional media personnel. Several districts have reduced their professional personnel in recent years due to a more stringent interpretation of the guidelines of title I, ESEA, which had provided funds previously. Utah is greatly in need of additional media professionals, especially for the local school. Too many schools are still without services of a professional media person.

Manpower needs in New Mexico continue to be a major problem. Only four of the larger districts have library supervisors, and many districts assign aides to elementary school libraries who are supervised by librarians in junior or senior high schools.

Most Arizona high schools are staffed to meet the North Central Accreditation Standards. These standards are not high, and most librarians agree that additional professional and technical staff is needed. Clerical assistance is needed in both high schools and elementary schools. The most critical need for better trained personnel is probably in private elementary schools. Some use parent volunteers. All districts are far from meeting ALA 1960 manpower standards.

All public schools in Hawaii have school library/media centers with professionally trained personnel. The greatest need now is to provide additional clerical help in these centers. Many of the private schools have adequate library/media centers with professional staff. Some of the smaller private schools have not, but several have reported hiring part-time librarians for the current school year.

There is a total of 1,696 schools in Washington State (1,099 elementary, 45 middle schools, 201 junior high schools, 301 senior high schools, 50 special schools). There were 541 (72 male; 469 female) professional learning resources specialists serving in the learning resources center at the elementary level and 347 (91 male; 256 female) professionals at the secondary level. Loss of special levies in many of the school districts throughout the State have been the primary cause of reduction in media staff -- professional and supportive -- at the building level. With 888 full-time learning resources specialists serving the 1,696 schools of the State, 808 buildings are still without a full-time specialist.

Even though the library-media centers in Oregon's small schools have made progress in establishing facilities, there are still large numbers of schools who have, as yet, just not made it. It is due mainly to two things: lack of sufficient funds at the district level and inability to procure qualified and competent personnel. These little schools make up the largest portion of districts who are not participating in title II. However, it must also be made clear that these small schools' enrollment makes up less than 8 percent of all the students in Grades K-12.

Most elementary schools in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands do not have libraries, but many are served by bookmobiles and some by media vans, or a combination of these, as in the case of the Library Boat that continued to serve the Truk District in fiscal year 1971. Manpower for these services is centralized in the district centers. Most outlying areas, therefore, have no media personnel of any sort, and the need for them is growing. Secondary schools have either libraries or resource centers, but staffing is weak and training continues through workshops and training programs at the East-West Center in Honolulu, Hawaii. There are supervisors of Library Services in two of the six districts.